DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 180 24 EA 004 725

AUTHOR	May, Robert E.; Doerge, Everett G.
TITLE	An Analysis of the Informational Items and Procedures Used in the Selection of Teachers in the Public School Systems of Louisiana. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Louisiana State Univ. and A and M Coll. System, Baton Rouge. School of Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-2-F-114
PUB DATE	1 Nov 72
CONTRACT	OEC-6-72-733(509)
NOTE	130p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Performance; Academic Records; Administrative Personnel; Educational Research; Interviews; *Personnel Directors; Personnel Policy; *Teacher Background; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Experience; *Teacher Qualifications; *Teacher Selection

ABSTRACT

This report describes a study designed to identify the informational and procedural items that school administrators believe to be useful in the selection of teachers for public school systems. The subjects for the study consisted of a panel of 11 personnel administration experts and 66 Louisiana public school personnel directors. A questionnaire was used to secure the data which were quantified according to a 5-point rating scale; and the analysis of variance was used for testing the significance of difference. Where a significant F-score resulted, the "t" technique was applied to determine the level of the difference. The study findings revealed that (1) 19 informational items were considered to be from very important to essential, 27 items to be from important to very important, 19 items to be from little importance to important, and six items of little or no importance in the selection of teachers; (2) 12 procedural items were considered to be from very important to essential, nine from important to very important, and seven from little importance to important; and (3) school districts in revising or updating their teacher selection programs should adopt the findings of this study in their local situations. (Author)

ED 070180

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

2 F 114
NO ERD

Final Report

Project No. 2F114
Contract No. OEC-6-72-733-(509)

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND PROCEDURES USED IN THE SELECTION OF TEACHERS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS OF LOUISIANA

Robert E. May and Everett G. Doerge

Louisiana State University
and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Baton Rouge, Louisiana

November 1, 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

EA 004 725

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
1. THE PROBLEM	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Definitions of Terms	4
Hypotheses	5
Value of the Study	6
Source of Data	7
Procedure	8
2. SURVEY OF LITERATURE	9
LEGAL ASPECTS	9
COURT DECISIONS	11
RELATED LITERATURE	20
Recruitment	21
Method Used in Selection	22
Criteria Related to Teacher Selection	24
Teacher Effectiveness	29
Test as Predictive Instrument	32
Assignment of Teachers	33
The Need for Further Research	34

Page

3. THE CONDUCT OF THE STUDY 36

SAMPLE 36

CONSTRUCTION AND VALIDATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE . . 36

TREATMENT OF DATA 40

4. PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA 41

INTRODUCTION 41

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS 42

PROCEDURAL ITEMS 69

TERMINAL ITEMS 82

5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . 86

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS 86

CONCLUSIONS 105

RECOMMENDATIONS 107

REFERENCES CITED 109

APPENDICES 114

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people, both individually and as members of groups, have made this study possible. Dr. Sam Adams, Dr. Francis A. Drury, Dr. William R. Eglin, Dr. J. Berton Gremillion, and Dr. Richard A. Musemeche constituted the committee which approved the research proposal; and Dr. Kenneth L. Koonce assisted with interpretation of computer print-outs. School officials of cooperating Louisiana public school districts and members of the panel of experts made evaluations which provided data for the study; the Louisiana Teachers' Association and the Louisiana School Boards Association made suggestions and assisted in securing cooperation of the school districts; the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare provided support for the project; and Miss Sandra Hernandez typed and edited the manuscript.

The research was conducted at Louisiana State University, and many members of the faculty and staff, in addition to those already named, assisted with various aspects of it.

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Number and Percentage of Returns for the Personnel Directors and the Panel of Experts	41
2.	Number and Percentage of Responses of Informational Items by Personnel Directors	43
3.	Means, Standard Errors and F-Score for Personnel Directors and Panel of Experts on Informational Items	48
4.	T-Ratios between Means of Importance of Informational Items for Personnel Directors and Panel of Experts	54
5.	Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Categories of Informational Items	55
6.	Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Family Background Category	56
7.	Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Personal Criteria	57
8.	Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Academic Criteria Category	58
9.	Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Examination Results Category	59
10.	Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Experience Related to Teaching Category	60
11.	Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Experience Unrelated to Teaching Category	61
12.	Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Job Requirements Category	62
13.	Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Professional Opinions Category	62
14.	Means, Standard Errors and F-Score between Category Items and Category Groups of Informational Items	63
15.	T-Ratios between Category Groups of Informational Items	64

Table Page

16. Table of Means of Category Goups for Personnel Directors and Panel of Experts 66

17. Independent Set of Comparisons for Personnel Directors . 67

18. Independent Set of Comparisons for Panel of Experts . . 68

19. Number and Percent of Responses on Procedural Items by Personnel Directors 70

20. F-Scores for Personnel Directors and the Panel of Experts Concerning Procedural Items 72

21. T-Ratios between Means of Importance of Procedural Items for Personnel Directors and the Panel of Experts..... 77

22. Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Procedural Categories 78

23. Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items for Acquiring a List of Candidates 79

24. Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items for the Collection of Information 80

25. Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Selection of Items 81

26. T-Ratios between Category Groups of Procedural Items . . 82

27. Number and Percent of Public School Systems Using or Not Using Objective Criteria 83

28. Number and Percent of Public School Systems Using Various Procedures in the Appointment of Teachers . . 84

29. Number and Percent of Public School Systems Requiring or Not Requiring the Signing of a Contract 84

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify the informational and procedural items which school administrators believed were useful in the selection of teachers for public school systems.

The subjects for this study consisted of a panel of eleven personnel administration experts and sixty-six Louisiana public school personnel directors.

A questionnaire was used to secure the data. The data collected were quantified according to a five-point rating scale and the analysis of variance was used for testing the significance of difference. Where a significant F-score resulted, the t technique was applied to determine the level of the difference.

The findings of this study were: (1) nineteen informational items were considered to be very important to essential, twenty-seven items to be important to very important, nineteen items as of little importance to important, and six items as of little or of no importance in the selection of teachers; (2) twelve procedural items were considered to be very important to essential, nine to be important to very important, and seven to be of little importance to important; (3) school districts in revising or updating their teacher selection programs should adopt the findings of this study to their local situation.

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

I. Introduction

One of the principal functions of the administrative staff, especially the Director of Personnel, is to fit competent and properly qualified teachers into each teaching position. When a vacancy occurs, each position should be filled from a reservoir of available and qualified personnel. At the same time, there may well be a few competent personnel in the local area without positions with suitable qualifications for the opening. It is well known, however, that such a condition is not generally obtained and that the problem of teacher selection is not new (Yeager, 1954:131).

Teacher employment and assignment in America was first recorded in Boston in 1635. Town records show that citizens voted to establish a school and set up rules not only to govern its curriculum and to regulate tuition and teacher's salaries but also to determine the qualifications of its teachers (Davis, 1966:1-10).

Initially the sole requirement for teaching in public schools was a knowledge of the subject matter or skills to be imparted and a desire to impart this knowledge to others (Cubberley, 1920:446).

With the decline of the Latin grammar school, a new type of school was established. The academy grew out of the need for practical subjects. The need then was for teachers who were competent in such

practical fields as navigation, accounting, and the modern foreign languages to prepare the students for the world of trade and business. During the era of the academies, the local school officials set their own standards and employed whom they desired. Many of the teachers had only an elementary education, while others had attended an academy and received the benefit of a secondary education (Davis, 1966:12-20).

When mass education became the accompaniment of the democratic movement, it brought with it one of education's most significant as well as difficult problems, the task of providing a sufficient number of teachers. Often teachers were appointed with little regard for their qualifications because of the great demand (Cubberley, 1920:446).

To safeguard against incompetent teachers and to protect the rights and welfare of its citizens, state boards of education introduced certification requirements which were thought to be more desirable in the selection of competent teachers than local examinations. When certification requirements became law, they were used as specifications for the curricula of institutions of higher learning and served as criteria for the selection of teachers (Yeager, 1954:43-45).

The various types of teacher's certificates, their requirements and the qualifications needed for renewal, are regulated by law or by state educational authority. Many educational leaders have expressed the opinion that these regulations and practices have promoted desirable standards within the profession by attracting bright and able young people, and by encouraging professional growth and development on the part of the teachers already in service (Davis, 1966:271).

During the last seventy years, the ratio between supply and demand of teachers fluctuated and the criteria used in the selection

of teachers varied according to the number of applicants available and filing for positions. From 1945 to 1954, the situation improved, largely because of greater emphasis on the economic and security aspects of the profession (Yeager, 1954:42-43). In the fall of 1964, there were more than 700,000 classroom teachers in the public secondary schools. As school enrollments continued to swell, the problem of filling positions with qualified teachers grew more and more severe. Another important factor concerning supply of teachers in the 1960's was the fact that available teachers were unevenly distributed in subject-matter areas (Davis, 1966:265).

At present, there is an oversupply of available teachers and data indicate that this oversupply will become much larger in the future. This oversupply of teachers is largely concentrated in the fields of English, foreign languages, and social sciences. Some openings remain in specialized fields as well as in physical education and industrial arts (Phi Delta Kappan, 1970).

In Louisiana the oversupply is credited to a decline in the rate of growth of the school-age population, the loss of some students to private schools, the consolidation of schools, better salaries, and the increasing number of teacher candidates graduating from the colleges and universities (Public Affairs Research Council, 1971b).

Due to the present oversupply of teachers and the predicted oversupply of prospective teachers, school administrators should have developed, or must develop, effective criteria and procedures for the selection of the most competent teachers.

II. Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to identify the informational and procedural items which, in the opinion of school administrators, are useful in the selection of teachers for the public school system in Louisiana. The study has attempted to answer the following questions:

A. What informational items are utilized by the personnel directors in the selection of teachers in the public school systems of Louisiana?

B. What informational items are considered to be more important to the selection of teachers by a panel of experts in school personnel administration in the State of Louisiana?

C. What information collected by the personnel director is weighted the most in the selection of teachers?

D. What procedures are used in the appointment of teachers in the public school systems of Louisiana?

E. What procedures are considered by a panel of experts in school personnel administration to be more important in the selection of teachers in the public school systems of Louisiana?

F. What conclusions can be drawn and what recommendations can be made which will enable school districts to evaluate and to improve their teacher recruitment program?

III. Definitions of Terms

A. Informational Item. This term refers to one of the various types of information gathered and to one of the various kinds of

materials devised to aid in the gathering of information used in the selection of teachers.

B. Procedural Item. This term is used to designate the course of action followed by the school systems in the selection of teachers.

C. Public School System. This term refers to any one of the sixty-four parish and two city school systems in Louisiana that are responsible for the administration and control of schools established under the provisions of the laws of the State of Louisiana.

D. Personnel Director. The term denotes the person or persons within the public school system whose responsibility it is to gather information and make recommendations concerning the selection of prospective teachers.

IV. Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were utilized in this study:

A. There are no significant differences in the opinions of personnel directors and a panel of experts as to the importance of each of the seventy-one items of information that may be used in the evaluation of prospective teachers.

B. There are no significant differences with respect to the hierarchy of the informational items utilized by the personnel directors in the selection of teachers.

C. Personnel directors indicate that there are no significant differences in importance of eight categories of informational items in the evaluation of teacher candidates for positions in the public school systems of Louisiana.

D. There are no significant differences in the importance of the informational items in the eight categories which may be utilized in the selection of teachers by personnel directors.

E. There are no significant differences in the opinions of personnel directors and a panel of experts as to the relative importance of the twenty-eight procedural items which may be utilized in the selection of teachers.

F. Personnel directors indicate that there are no significant differences with respect to the importance of the procedural items which may be utilized in the selection of teachers.

G. Personnel directors indicate that there are no significant differences in the importance of the three categories of procedural items which may be utilized in the selection of teachers.

H. There are no significant differences in the importance of the procedural items in the three categories that may be utilized in the selection of teachers by personnel directors.

V. Value of the Study

The fact that large numbers of applicants are now, and will for the forseeable future continue to be, competing for teaching positions, makes imperative establishment by all school systems of valid criteria which will assure the selection of the most competent teachers from among those who are available.

Good instruction depends upon competent teachers and the selection of competent teachers depends upon the information and procedures used by the school system in the securing and maintaining of good teachers. Further, mounting educational needs of children

make increasing demands on the intelligence, culture, social insight, professional preparation and personality of teachers. School administrative officials must use every feasible means of supplementing applicants college records with other information in order that the teacher best qualified for the position may be employed. Each teacher appointment in a school system represents a potential gain or loss to the system in terms of goal accomplishment.

The manner in which the tenure laws of the state operate makes dismissal of tenured teachers very difficult, and reemphasizes the importance of the teacher selection process.

The specific significance of this study is determined by the particular informational items and procedures used in the selection of teachers and by the fact that selection decisions are based on this information. This study will also provide the administrator, teacher, and board member with the most frequently used informational items, and procedures utilized in the selection of prospective teachers and will seek new answers to fit the new times in the selection of teachers.

VI. Source of Data

Data for this study were secured by means of a questionnaire submitted to the Personnel Directors within each public school system and by means of an interview. Conferences were held with the Director of Personnel in selected school systems to review and validate the questionnaire. Materials and forms used by the school systems in the selection of teachers were also obtained and analyzed.

VII. Procedure

In the collection and treatment of data the following steps were taken in sequence:

1. A questionnaire was developed to serve as the source of basic data for the study.

2. A panel of experts was selected in the field of school personnel administration.

3. The questionnaire was then mailed to each member of the panel with an accompanying letter requesting him to study each item as to its importance to the selection of teachers.

4. A questionnaire was mailed to the Personnel Directors within each public school system in the State of Louisiana, with an accompanying letter requesting him to study each item as to its importance in the selection of teachers in that particular school system.

Chapter 2

SURVEY OF LITERATURE

I. Legal Aspects

The United States Constitution makes no mention of education; however, the Federal Government has exercised authority over education through interpretations of parts of the Constitution, rulings of the Supreme Court, and through legislation.

The Fourteenth Amendment (1868) was passed for the purpose of removing all legal distinctions among persons born or naturalized in the United States. For many years, the amendment had no impact on segregation of schools because few Negroes attended schools. As a consequence, there is little history of the effect of the Fourteenth Amendment on public education until recent years. In the first such cases, the Supreme Court established the "separate but equal" doctrine (Plessy vs. Fergerson, 1896). In 1954, this doctrine was reversed (Brown vs. Board of Education, 1954).

The Civil Rights Act (1964) authorized the Federal Government to initiate court suits against laggard school districts which refused to desegregate and directed the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to cut off federal aid to school districts which practice discrimination. In turn HEW set standards of desegregation which school districts must meet to retain federal aid, and helped draw up plans for districts to meet those standards.

Article VI, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution (1789) reads:

> This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the constitution or Law of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

According to the Tenth Amendment (1789) "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." Although public education is a matter left to the states, with few exceptions, such as special schools for the handicapped and for delinquents, state governments do not directly operate the public schools. Operation of schools has been largely delegated by state governments to local governmental units.

The Constitution of the State of Louisiana, 1921, as amended, and Acts of the Legislature, are the sources of school law in Louisiana. Article XII of the Constitution of the State of Louisiana (1921) delegates the responsibility of education to the parish and city school boards and sets up the State Board of Education as a supervisory and regulatory authority over public schools.

The State Board of Education has specific constitutional authority to prescribe the qualifications of teachers and to provide for the certification of teachers in elementary, secondary, trade, normal, and institutions of higher learning.

The general school law (Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, 17:81) which deals with the general powers of local school boards reads as follows:

> Each school board is authorized to make such rules and regulations for its own government, not inconsistent with law or with the regulations of the Louisiana State Board of Education, as it may deem proper.

Local school boards have considerable amount of flexibility to make rules and to establish policies relative to the criteria used for selection, the procedures of selection, and, finally, the appointment of teachers.

The local school boards are restricted from appointing non-certified teachers. The prerequisites for employment (Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, 17:413) specify that:

> No person shall be appointed to teach without a written contract for the scholastic year in which the teaching is to be done. Every teacher shall hold a certificate of a grade sufficiently high to meet the requirements of his position. Parish superintendents of schools shall ascertain definitely, before contracting with a teacher, that the teacher holds a certificate issued by the State Board of Education.

Louisiana Revised Statute 17:442 (1950) provides that each teacher shall serve a probationary term of three years. This will necessitate periodic detailed evaluation of the aptitutde, attitude, demeanor, and professional growth of each probationary teacher. The local school administration is left with the responsibility and duty of devising ways to collect and review information regarding each probationary teacher.

II. Court Decisions

Court decisions affecting teacher selection, employment, and assignment have been primarily connected with desegregation of the schools and with the collective bargaining powers of school board employees.

The question involved in Plessy vs. Ferguson (1896) was the validity of a Louisiana statute requiring separation of races in trains traveling within the state. The Supreme Court stated:

> Laws permitting or even requiring separation of races in places where they are liable to be brought into contact do not necessarily imply the inferiority of either race to the other, and has been generally, if not universally, recognized as within the competency of state legislatures in the exercise of their police powers.

The educational implications of this court decision were not only to establish the doctrine of "separate but equal" facilities for the white and black children but also the assignment of teachers according to race.

In Cumming vs. Richmond County Board of Education (1899), the point of the issue was the right of a Georgia school board to provide high school facilities for white children without providing similar opportunity for Negro children. The opinion wrote by Justice Harlan stated:

> . . . the education of the people in schools maintained by state taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States and any interference on the part of Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land.

This decision seemed to reaffirm the validity of the "separate but equal" doctrine and placed the states and local boards with complete authority of management of the schools and the assignment of teachers and pupils.

The Supreme Court in Berea College vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky, 1908, resorted to a legal technicality and avoided ruling on the constitutionality of a state law prohibiting intermingling of the races in private colleges.

In 1927, the Supreme Court in another decision written by Chief Justice Taft unequivocably reaffirmed the validity of the "separate but equal" doctrine (Gong Lum vs. Rice, 1927).

From 1938 to 1953, multifarious cases were brought to compel admission of Negroes as students to graduate schools. They were: Missouri ex rel Gaines vs. Canada, Registrar of the University of Missouri (1938); Sipuel vs. Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma (1948); McLaurin vs. Oklahoma State Regents of Higher Education (1950); and Sweatt vs. Painter (1950).

In the Gaines Case (1938), the Court's attitude toward educational segregation began to harden and the ultimate condemnation of separate education seemed to be foretold.

The principle that equal facilities must be provided by and within the state for both races at the graduate level was established by the Sipuel Case (1948).

The McLaurin Case (1950) attacked the validity of requiring a Negro to sit in a special section of the classroom and separate from whites in other facilities of the University of Oklahoma.

In the Sweatt Case (1950), decided on the same day as the McLaurin Case, the Court defined what constituted "equal" facilities. The Court stated that the establishment of a separate school for Negroes, comparable in physical facilities to the school for members of the white race, would not of necessity constitute an equal opportunity.

The court decision in this case was the first to recognize the inadequacy of the Negro schools and quality of educational processes provided the students by it.

It was at this time that several cases originating in Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, Delaware and in the District of Columbia were filed and ruled upon in Brown vs. Board of Education, (1954). In its sociological, rather than legal, treatise, the Court concluded that "in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." The decision observed that when the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted in 1868, it was not particularly important to determine whether the legality of the separation by races in schools was or was not in the minds of the drawers of the amendment. The Court pointed out that the very nature of education has been completely changed since that time and also that the place of the Negro in our society has undergone a complete change. The Court rejected any language in Plessy vs. Ferguson which might be contrary to the modern psychological findings. The Court held that to separate children from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of race generates a feeling of inferiority.

The Bolling vs. Sharp (1954) decision was made on the same day and was the same decision as that of the Brown Case. It was made separate because the Fourteenth Amendment had no application to the District of Columbia.

Lesson (1964) reported that Negro students in various school districts filed action suits on behalf of teachers and administrators. They constituted segregated student bodies as outlined in the Brown decision. The Supreme Court declined to rule on these cases at that time.

The Court reiterated its emphasis on the timing of desegregation of 1964 when it said that the "time for mere 'deliberate speed' has run out" (Griffin vs. County School Board of Prince Edward County, 1964).

In Rogers vs. Paul (1965), the Supreme Court ruled that racial allocation of faculty denies equality of educational opportunity.

In the case, United States vs. Jefferson County Board of Education (1967), the Court accepted the adoption of a freedom of choice plan for desegregation. After this ruling, most school districts under desegregation order implemented the freedom of choice plan known as the "Jefferson-Model."

In the case of Green vs. New Kent County, Va. (1968), the Supreme Court held that a "freedom of choice" plan is not unconstitutional of itself, but that it is not "a sufficient step" to desegregation. For any desegregation plan to be acceptable, it must bring about complete dismantling of the dual school system and convert it into a unitary, non-racial system.

It was self-evident from this ruling that for a plan to be acceptable it must bring about complete integration of students and faculty in all of the schools.

The Supreme Court in Alexander vs. Holmes (1969) proclaimed that time for "all deliberate speed" had run out. This ended the dual system of education.

In Hall vs. St. Helena Parish School Board (1969), the freedom of choice plan was held to be unacceptable basis for student assignments. The district court's order contained no specific provision for faculty desegregation, although the school board indicated that it would attempt

to obtain voluntary teacher transfers and if necessary would adopt additional means for desegretating faculties.

In Singleton (1969), supra, the Court directed the reassignment of teachers and other staff so that the ratio of white to Negro teachers and staff in each school would approximate the ratio of white to Negro teachers and staff in the system as a whole.

The Singleton Decree, in paragraphs two and three, is quoted as follows:

> 2. Staff members who work directly with children, and professional staff who work on the administrative level will be hired; assigned, promoted, paid, demoted, dismissed, and otherwise treated without regard to race, color, or national origin.
>
> 3. If there is to be a reduction in the number of principals, teachers, teacher-aides, or other professional staff employed by the school district which will result in a dismissal or demotion of any such staff members, the staff member to be dismissed or demoted must be selected on the basis of objective and reasonable non-discriminatory standards from among all the staff of the district. In addition, if there is any such dismissal or demotion, no staff vacancy may be filled through recruitment of a person of a race, color, or national origin different from that of the individual dismissed or demoted, until each displaced staff member who is qualified has had an opportunity to fill the vacancy and has failed to accept an offer to do so.

The Court directed the school districts, to the extent necessary to carry our this desegregation plan, to direct members of its staff as a condition to continued employment to accept new assignments. This was to be done no later than February 1, 1970.

The Singleton requirement did not contemplate freezing the faculty ratio which is present when faculty desegregation takes place in the system. It contemplated rather that faculty desegregation would be accomplished by invoking the system-wide ratio as a rule for each particular school in the system. After a unitary system has been

established, the system-wide ratio may change from time to time as a result of non-discriminatory application of objective merit standards in the selection and composition of faculty and staff.

In United States vs. Mongomery County Board of Education (1969), the Supreme Court approved the requirement of the Singleton Decree for the racial integration of faculty and staff personnel in accordance with the racial-balance formula.

Robert Carter vs. West Feliciana Parish School Board (1970) was concerned with the use of the National Teacher Examinations as one of the criteria for teacher evaluation. The district court declined to grant a permanent injunction and dissolved the temporary restraining order, stating that it would be necessary to allocate the lay off of teachers according to the faculty assignment ratio of the district. The district court ruled that NTE results would be necessary for the school board to compare grades of Negro teachers with other Negro teachers and those of white teachers with other white teachers in order to maintain the ratio at all times.

The Louisiana Teachers' Association (1969) in its memorandum amicus curiae in the Singleton and Carter Cases stated:

> The best and most appropriate assignment of teachers is or should be a major concern of all school administrators and school boards. Teachers are above all . . . human . . . not ciphers in an equation. They vary considerably in qualifications, they are certificated in specific subject fields, and by temperament they are suited for some roles and not others regardless of specific or technical qualifications.

In its memorandum the LTA asked the Court to give the school districts more time in formulating a plan for faculty desegregation and not to enact the decision in the middle of the school year.

The appellants in the Carter Case also projected that dismissals may possibly result in violation of the Louisiana State Constitution or the Louisiana Tenure Law. The Court stated that provisions of state constitutions or state statutes must yield under the supremacy clause of the United States Constitution.

The Mecklenburg Decree (1970), by the Supreme Court, addressed itself to the problem that has continuously caused dissension in this country: the duties of school authorities and the scope of powers of the federal courts to eliminate racially separate public schools established and maintained by state action. The issues settled were:

> 1. It specifically approved the Singleton decision. Mecklenburg Case is absolute authority for the fact that if there is any difference in the schools according to racial composition of students and teachers, there has been a substantive constitutional violation of rights under the equal protection clause.
>
> 2. It laid to rest the question often litigated in district courts concerning the equity powers of federal district courts as related to the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The basis of this conclusion was that the Constitution says no state shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." (School Systems and Federal Courts, 1971)

In Lee and United States vs. Chilton County Board of Education (1971), the Court promulgated the following non-racial objective criteria to be used in the employing, dismissing, transferring, and demoting of teachers: Type of certificate; number of years of experience in the teaching profession, in the grade, subject or position which the teacher currently occupies, and in the system; degree or degrees held; endorsement in subject area; number of hours beyong degree; and number of hours of voluntary participation in in-service training, workshops, seminars, etc.

In Graham, et al., vs. Evangeline Parish School Board (1971), the Department of Justice recommended the set of criteria mandated by the District Court in the Lee Case.

In Smith and United States vs. Concordia Parish School Board (1971), the plaintiffs proposed a similar proposal as mandated by the Court in the Lee Case, with the addition of a Committee of Standards to weight the factors and determine the applicants' total scores, with the provision that the applicant with the highest numerical score be chosen. The members on the Committee on Standards would consist of two white and two black members appointed by a bi-racial committee from the faculty of Concordia Parish School System. The Department of Justice suggested that selection of teachers be based upon professional preparation, giving the various degrees of certification a number of points and each semester hour earned above the baccalaureate degree a point, and upon experience, by giving five points for each year of teaching experience.

The Concordia Parish School Board suggested for consideration the mandated criteria set by the Singleton and Carter Cases when the Court decreed conversion to a unitary system.

Both the Graham Case and the Smith Case are pending until all parties have submitted their recommendations for consideration by the Court.

The two cases dealing with the collective bargaining powers of teachers are Maryland vs. Wirtz (1968) and McLaughlin vs. Tilendis (1968).

The Supreme Court in Maryland vs. Wirtz (1968) viewed public education as an enterprise with substantial direct interstate

implications. Based on the observation that work stoppages involving employees of schools and hospitals interrupt and burden the flow of goods across state lines, the Court ruled that minimum wage amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act were constitutional and that they covered non-professional, non-executive, and non-administrative employees of public schools, hospitals and related institutions.

In the McLaughlin Case (1968), the Supreme Court indicated clearly that public employees have the same rights to organize and bargain as do employees in the private sector. In this case, a non-tenure teacher charged that he had been fired because he belonged to a union. The Court held that, under the Civil Rights Act of 1971, the teacher was entitled to relief damages against the superintendent of schools and the school board, and that "unjustified interference" with the teacher's freedom to associate violates the "due process" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

III. Related Literature

Many educators believe that status studies in which large amounts of demographic and other descriptive data are systematically gathered and enumerated in endless tables do not constitute research. Much of the literature on personnel policies and practices consists largely of just such tables and charts rendering practical answers and serving as a basis for trend predictions. No written works found were concerned individually with the aspects of historical or philosophical issues of personnel policies.

The importance of personnel policies has increased and is given preference over other administrative functions. However, a

definite program of personnel policies and procedures for their execution has been rarely accomplished for school systems.

The following is a summary of the most pertinent issues treated in the extensive amount of literature reviewed. For the sake of clarity in both the discussion and reading, these issues have been grouped under main headings. Such grouping allows each category to be clearly defined and discussed without the duplication and overlapping found in the literature itself.

Recruitment

The immediate purpose of recruitment is to secure the personnel that the school system needs. There are numerous articles, sections of books, and studies on recruitment. Most of the literature is in the form of testimonial comments, surveys, or textbook theoretical writings. A great need for research in recruitment was observed.

Since recruitment is directly related to the manpower supply and demand figure of qualified teachers, a carefully organized and executed recruitment program is perhaps the prime determiner of a quality educational program (Henderson, 1960).

When a vacancy occurs, the administrator must turn to some source of supply in order to secure the names of persons who might be qualified to fill it. Miller and Spalding (1952) listed five major sources: the local file, teacher agencies, institutional organizations, and the placement services of state educational departments.

Steffensen (1963:17-18) reported that while personnel departments agreed in accepting responsibility for the coordination of the recruitment program, the procedures used varied in detail. He enumerated four areas

of administrative policies: geographic limitations, the extent of position descriptions, the use of teacher examinations, and qualifications considerations.

Gremillion (1965) found that the most widely employed methods of recruiting teachers were through applications filed voluntarily by the candidates and through names obtained from placement bureaus in colleges and universities. Personal interviews were held by all the school systems in the selection of applicants and were largely the responsibility of the superintendent. He found forty-eight percent of the school boards had no residence requirements; however, thirty-eight percent of the school boards gave perference to the residents of the parish and state.

Lowe (1971) surveyed twenty-five business teachers in Illinois about their recent interviewing experiences. Sixty-four percent indicated that they were interviewed by more than one official before a contract was offered by the system. Forty-four percent of the participants indicated they had learned of the position vacancies through the placement office in colleges and universities.

Methods Used in Selection

The selection decision depends upon the selection method used. Methods for assessing the applicants' qualifications vary from one extreme on a continuum to the other.

Scott (1964:89-99) compared a clinical method for the selection of teachers to the actuarial method. The clinical approach is based on the assumption that both the individuals and the job are too complex to be adequately investigated. Basic to this assumption is the idea

that there are many different teaching approaches and classroom interaction processes which lead to comparable end results. The actuarial method is that the position to be filled forces a careful search for different dimensions of teaching success. Predictor variables and criterion measures are then used in the selection of teachers.

Toops (1945) outlined five methods to be followed in the selection of teachers. The methods are:

1. The summation-of-characteristic-scores method. By this method bits of information are grouped according to the characteristic to which it is believed they relate.

2. The successive hurdle method. The successive hurdle method is especially useful if validity coefficients for the position have been determined. Then successive hurdles are applied in descending order of their validity until the desired number of applicants remain.

3. The precise profile method. This method is used when certain levels of the characteristics and qualities evaluated are deemed essential for success on the job, so that if the applicant does not have precisely the skill-patterned, or profile, he should not be considered.

4. The minimum divergence from desired profile method. By this method every candidate is compared with the ideal profile, and a measure of his disparity from that profile is obtained. The top candidate is the one with the minimum divergence.

5. The predominant or outstanding merit method. Each candidate is screened for predominant or outstanding characteristics or qualities. This method gives unusual weight in selection to those persons who possess unusual excellence in more than one characteristic.

Di Pasquale (1970), in a resume, stated that all decisions affecting teacher selection, employment, and retention should be a team judgement. The team would consist of parents, minority groups, professionals, and, where feasible, students.

Chandler (1955) said it was necessary that the administrator share his responsibility for selection with other staff members. He

suggested that policies provide for staff participation in selection, that the superintendent nominate the candidates chosen, and that the board of education employ upon the recommendation of the superintendent.

The role of the selection process in the total personnel program is such that it demands the constant attention of administrative officials if it is to function effectively. Administrators should make use of all those procedures and practices which are found to be useful in the selection of teachers.

Criteria Related to Teacher Selection

Many authorities agree that no one factor should be considered when evaluating applicants for teaching positions, rather that teacher selection should be determined by several factors.

Monroe (1950) asserted that of the factors related to the selection of teachers only four are indicated as being important. These are intelligence, scholarship, personality, and scores earned on professional information and subject matter tests.

Ellsbree and Reutter (1954:57-63) listed the following criteria for evaluation of prospective teachers:

1. Personal and social characteristics: age; appearance; personal adjustment, and emotional stability; social adjustment; sense of humor; friendliness; a certain amount of aggressiveness; organization of the personality; voice and speech; posture and self confidence.

2. Intellectual abilities: ability to understand and express ideas; judgement; good reasonings, and good English.

3. Background: general cultural knowledge; professional knowledge; knowledge of world problems; special competence in the chosen field; and special aptitudes such as abilities to supervise athletics and extracurricular activities.

4. Educational and guidance philosophy: attitude toward younger generation; attitude toward students in general; and attitude toward racial groups and minorities.

5. Ability and aptitude in instruction and classroom techniques: ability to plan and organize work; acceptance of each child as an individual; ability to develop students to their full potentialities; skill in maintenance of a healthy classroom environment; skill in aiding students to acquire a mastery of subject matter; and ability to develop capacity to apply this knowledge to practical life situations.

6. Professional and non-professional experience: experience and training, both professional and non-professional; scholastic standing; and general accomplishments.

7. Potentialities for professional growth: enthusiasm for teaching; genuine liking for children; interest in advancement; membership in professional organizations; participation in in-service training; and advanced professional courses.

Brooks (1967) surveyed administrators, teachers, and nine authorities to determine the value of possible criteria used in the evaluation of teacher prospects. He found twenty items as being very important to essential, twenty-nine items as being important to very important, and eight items as being of little importance to important in the selection of teachers.

The items found to be very important to essential were voice and speech, loyalty to the United States, personality traits, interest in teaching as a career, interest in children, ability to get along with others, use of language, type of certificate held, degrees held, degrees held, cooperation with teachers, cooperation with parents, health, character, dependability, emotional stability, ability to communicate with pupils, ability to get along with pupils, ability to maintain classroom discipline, willingness to accept responsibility, and ability to plan and organize work.

Those items found to be important to very important were age, sex, photograph, neatness, dress and grooming, credit record, ability to formulate dieas in writing, special abilities, professor's appraisal of teaching ability, supervising teacher's appraisal, grades in professional courses, number and types of courses in minor field, number and type of professional courses taken, courses completed in last three years, knowledge of philosophy of education, knowledge of tests and measurements, recency of teaching experience, experience other than teaching, membership in professional organizations, mental ability, grades in teaching fields, grades in student teaching, knowledge of teaching techniques, knowledge of child growth and development, knowledge of learning processes, length of teaching experience, cooperation with administration, and understanding of teacher's code of ethics.

He found marital status, number and age of children, extent of travel, non-academic activities, hobbies, belief in a Supreme Being, occupational aptitudes, and social background to be little to important in the evaluation of prospective teachers. The study also indicated that fraternity membership, race and color, church affiliation, economic background, and service club membership were of little or of no importance.

Teachers have contributed to the list of criteria for the evaluation of prospective replacements to their positions. In a study conducted by Weber (1954:38-39), teachers were asked to write the specifications for their successors, assuming they were leaving the system. The general nature of the items included are as follows: subject matter preparation; professional preparation; health, age,

sex, general physical attributes; non-teaching work experience; scholastic and extrascholastic activities; attitudes toward children; character; personality traits; race, color, creed; personal habits; the kind of person that would support the applicant; sincere interest in children; special abilities needed; hobbies and interests; social life and experience; travel; professional philosophy; business ability; financial record; honesty; and personal grooming.

The Louisiana Teachers' Association, upon the appeal of the Concordia Parish School Board, hired Dr. George Redfern, Associate Executive Secretary of the American Association of School Administrators and Dr. Byron Hansford, Executive Secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, as consultants to Mr. Tom Kendrick and Lyndon Lee of the Office of Health, Education and Welfare; Dean Lisso Simmons of Southeastern Louisiana University, Chairman of the LTA-TEPS Commission; Dean Milton Ferguson of Louisiana State University, New Orleans; and Dean T. P. Southerland of Northwestern State University.

This group developed a set of criteria for promotion of school personnel; however, these criteria have not been adopted by the LTA, the LSBA, the State Department of Education, or the Concordia Parish School Board.

The criteria factors to be utilized in the employment of faculty personnel are based upon professional preparation, performance on a standardized evaluation instrument, personal interview, and professional and character references.

Under professional preparation, points were given according to certification. A non-certified teacher with no degree received a

minus fifty points, a certified teacher with no degree and a non-certified teacher with a degree received no points. A certified teacher teaching out of the area of certification received fifty points. A certified teacher with a Bachelor's Degree teaching in an area of certification received one hundred points if his grade average were from 2.00 to 2.49, one hundred fifty points if his grade average were 2.50 to 2.99, two hundred points if his grade average were 3.00 to 3.49, two hundred fifty points if his grade average were 3.50 to 4.00. Additional points were given if the teacher had a master's degree or above.

The commons section of the National Teacher Examinations was justified as a standard evaluation instrument and the teacher was assigned points according to his score on the test. A score of 499 or above received one hundred points, a score from five hundred through 599 received one hundred points, a score from six hundred through 659 received two hundred points, and a score of 660 or above received two hundred fifty points.

The personal interview, conducted by the school system's regular employment personnel, would yield a maximum score of one hundred points. This professional evaluation would be based upon an effectively structured instrument.

The professional and character references would also carry a maximum of one hundred points.

After points were assigned, the four criteria would be weighted as follows: professional preparation and standardized instrument points would be multiplied by four; the points received on

the personal interview by three; and professional and character references by two (Louisiana Teachers' Association, 1971).

Teacher Effectiveness

Review of literature conducted to ascertain the characteristics or combination of characteristics that are closely associated with teacher competency reveals that in most cases the relationships between the teacher characteristics studied and measures of teacher effectiveness were nonexistent, low, or disparate.

Although there are no definite objective measurements for teacher effectiveness, characteristics have been identified as being related to subjective judgments of teaching ability.

Lykken and Rose (1962) identified subgroups of differentially predictable persons. Using the Actuarial Pattern Analysis Method and configural scoring, they divided the variables into subgroups, and calculated the separate coefficients for each subgroup.

Ghiselli and Haire (1960) reported research giving evidence that the validity coefficients of various selection tests for different criteria vary over time. They concluded that "the practice of using performance data obtained during an intitial period and letting it stand for total performance completely ignores the dynamic character of the criterion and changes that are taking place in the worker's performance."

Cuban (1970) measured teacher effectiveness in terms of the impact of teacher behavior on the cognitive and affective behavior of the student.

Ryans (1960b) in his brief on research studies, indicated that the probable variables related to teacher effectiveness included measured intellectual abilities, achievement in college courses, general cultural and special subject matter knowledge, professional information, student teaching marks, emotional adjustment, attitudes favorable to students, generosity in appraisals, strong interest in reading and literary matters, interest in music and painting, participation in social and community affairs, and participation in avocational activities.

Ryans (1960) considered teaching effectiveness as related to the marital status of teachers. He found that correlations between marital status and effectivness vary in terms of the criterion used but a general pattern was discernible. In the elementary grades, married or divorced teachers appeared to be superior to single or widowed teachers.

Buley (1950) indicated that a highly desirable attribute for a school system was origin of at least half of the staff outside of the state. A dichotomy was established for this factor and the applicant was either born within or outside the state. His study also indicated that teaching staffs with the highest proportion of teachers who had completed courses in three or more subject areas tended to score higher on the staff quality criterion.

Barr (1961) showed the overall grade point average to be a reliable predictor of effectiveness in his study. He concluded that an average in excess of C+ appears to be essential. He also indicated that principals and supervisors most often rated as superior those teachers who earned an A in student teaching.

Slezak (1959) used the number of graduate hours completed by applicants as a possible predictor of teacher effectiveness. He found an advanced degree in administration was one of the five best predictors of teacher success.

Turner (1964) indicated teachers who had attended higher institutions of 1,000, or larger, enrollment scored significantly higher on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Survey, and showed significantly greater growth in teaching ability between the first and third years of teaching. However, after three years of teaching experience, teachers from schools of under 1,000 students showed no increase in teaching ability over that shown by student-teacher grades.

Although the nature and extent of the significance of situational factors have not been entirely verified by empirical evidence, studies which have been completed tend to support various criteria for predicting teacher effectiveness.

Knox (1956) found certain categories of the environment which appeared to be closely related to efficiency in teaching. They were instructional materials, the students, the faculty, and the school organization.

Kleinman (1960) found in a study of situational factors regarding teacher satisfaction that the degree of a teacher's knowledge of situational factors prior to accepting a teaching position was positively related to the degree of teacher satisfaction.

Dixon (1948:11-14) pointed out that the kinds of teachers to be selected depend upon the kinds of schools that districts wished to develop. She mentioned that the propsective appointee should understand fully the basic philosophy of the school system.

Combs and Soper conducted research with good and poor teachers to determine if the good teachers had greater insight into the characteristics of a good helping relationship than the poor teachers (Blume, 1971).

Popham (1971) reported the results of recent investigations which revealed that experienced teachers may not be significantly more proficient than nonteachers with respect to accomplishing intended behavior changes in learners.

As can be seen, there has been much effort made to find criteria that are universally applicable; however, research has not yielded meaningful and measurable criteria of teacher effectiveness which the majority of the nation's educators can support.

Tests as a Predictive Instrument

The unifying of school districts has created peculiar problems for the administrators of the schools. The most notable are reductions in teaching staffs and changes in hiring policies following the merger of black and white staffs.

School boards and superintendents in many federal court districts of the South are charged to develop objective criteria in hiring, especially in retaining or dismissing teachers. Many of the districts have chosen tests, and the most commonly chosen test is the National Teacher Examinations. The NTE are achievement tests consisting of two parts: The Common Examinations, reviewing college preparation in professional education and general education, and the Teaching Area Examinations, reviewing the candidate's field of specialization.

Deneen (1971) reports four abuses of the NTE: using it to describe a good teacher, using it to measure the totality of teaching, using the examination of scholastic knowledge as the sole criterion for dismissing inservice teachers, and setting arbitrary cut-off scores. Deneen also points out the contribution tests can make. A score on a valid, reliable test is objective in the sense that it is not subject to the biases of those to whom it is reported, while interviews, observations, and other procedures may well be.

A survey by Farr (1965) was concerned with the administration and the utilization of tests in teacher education programs at 442 institutions. Wide variety in tests and locally-oriented, experimental efforts were noted but promising developments were few in number.

Hall and Vincent (1960) made a study to test the validity of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory as a predictive instrument in the selection of good teaching prospects. They found a slight positive correlation between MTAI test scores and criterion ratings. The findings indicated that the instrument has very little value for predictive purposes.

To summarize, the several research studies reviewed reveal that tests have not proven to be reliable instruments to predict success for prospective teachers. Efforts in this direction continue, but developments have shown little promise.

Assignment of Teachers

The review of the literature in the area of assignment revealed attempts to give written answers to commonplace questions raised by the novice teacher.

When a prospective teacher has been selected, he generally receives some official notification. This may or may not be the formal contract, but often includes salary information, the employment calendar, and notice of other related matters to be completed. At this time, assignment may be determined, depending upon the supply and qualifications of those selected, and school, grade, or subject (American Association of School Administration, 1960:159-160).

Teaching load is associated with the actual classroom teaching assignment, as Cartetter (1962:160) has pointed out. The newly appointed teacher finds herself assigned to many extra duties not before mentioned.

Smith (1961:221) listed some of the more common practices of reducing beginning-teacher workloads: aides or specialists to conduct study halls and recreational activities; clerical help; and teacher-aides in classrooms.

The Need for Further Research

According to Bowman (1963:342), there was little good research in teacher personnel to be reviewed, and there was a need for further study and for development of new techniques.

The Bureau of Education Personnel Development of the Office of Education established "Task Force 72." One of the five major problems this Task Force listed was the lack of accepted criteria for good teaching (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1971).

Durflinger (1963) in a review of literature concerning recruitment and selection procedures for teacher preparation programs,

concluded that ". . . research efforts must rely upon previous investigations in the measurement and prediction of teacher effectiveness or must make some unique contribution to knowledge in this area." Criticized were the lack of replication of investigations, seemingly diverse test batteries and populations, and the lack of general direction of the findings. Large cooperative studies were recommended.

The Public Affairs Research Council (1971) indicated that from the administrative standpoint, a compelling need exists to develop truly objective criteria in order to evaluate not only the beginning teacher's potential, but the existing teacher's performance in the classroom as well.

Chapter 3

CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

I. Sample

The subjects who submitted information and analyzed data for this study consisted of a panel of eleven experts in the field of school personnel administration and sixty-six personnel directors of the public school systems in the State of Louisiana. Their responses were invited for the 1971-72 school year.

The panel of experts consisted of seven university professors and four directors of personnel at universities in the State of Louisiana.

The personnel directors in the public school systems consisted of sixty-four parish and two city school system personnel directors.

II. Construction and Validation of the Questionnaire

A questionnaire was used for securing the data for this study. The format of the questionnaire was originated by Brooks (1967). The method of construction and validation of this instrument is described below.

A list of informational items and a list of teacher selection procedures were compiled from recommendations of various authorities in the field of school personnel administration. An item of information recommended by any one authority was included in the original questionnaire.

The next step was the selection of a panel of experts in the field of school personnel administration. The panel was chosen upon the recommendations of professors at Louisiana State University and several Deans of Education at various universities in Louisiana. The panel was composed of seven professors and four directors of personnel of universities in Louisiana. The professors included Doctors L. L. Fulmer, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge; Robert Ducharme, University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette; Melvin L. Gruwell, Tulane University, New Orleans; Robert C. Von Brock, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge; Joseph Wilson, Southern University, Baton Rouge; Clint Miller, Louisiana Tech University, Ruston; and T. Eugene Holtzclaw, Northeast Louisiana University, Monroe. The directors of personnel were Dean Tom Paul Southerland, Northwestern State University, Natchitoches; Dean Robert B. Landers, McNeese State University, Lake Charles; Dean Lisso R. Simmons, Southeastern Louisiana University, Hammond; and Dean Milton L. Ferguson, Louisiana State University, New Orleans.

The questionnaire was then mailed to the panel of experts with an accompanying letter requesting each to respond to all items, and to denote, by checking in a column provided any item he considered not valid for this study. In addition, each respondent was requested to check each item as <u>essential</u>, <u>very important</u>, <u>important of little importance</u>, or <u>of no importance</u> to the selection of teachers. They were also asked to add any item of information or selection procedure which he felt would make the questionnaire complete.

After receipt of the completed questionnaire from the members of the panel of experts, the responses were analyzed for the purpose

of making revisions in the instrument to conform to the suggestions of the panel.

The meaning of one informational item was questioned by one member of the panel. Two members of the panel questioned the validity of several tests listed, but not necessarily the item itself. No member of the panel questioned any of the procedural items. As a result of suggestions made by the panel and in response to questions which they raised, the informational items on the questionnaire were revised by making several items more specific. Accordingly, the number of informational items was increased from a total of 68 to 71.

The reliability of the questionnaire was validated by means of interviews. The author conferred with persons responsible for developing lists of teachers to be recommended for employment in four parishes, Mr. James Bailey, Washington Parish; Mr. John E. Fitzpatrick, East Baton Rouge Parish; Mr. Carlus Morgan, Webster Parish; and Mr. Wendell Hall, East Feliciana Parish, and asked them to review each item on the questionnaire to determine its reliability. They agreed that the data necessary for this study could be obtained through the use of the revised questionnaire.

The questionnaire (Appendix III) was divided into three parts Part I consisted of seventy-one items of information that could be used in the evaluation of applicants for teaching positions. Part II consisted of twenty-eight procedures that could be used in the selection of prospective teachers. The items in Part I and II were followed by columns headed <u>essential</u>, <u>very important</u>, <u>important</u>, <u>of little importance</u>, and <u>of no importance</u>. Part III contained three sections of possible terminal procedures that might be utilized by the school

system in the appointment of teachers. The items in Part III were preceded by a blank for the checking of the item utilized by the school system.

The questionnaire was then mailed to the Personnel Directors in the sixty-four parish and two city school systems in the State of Louisiana with an accompanying letter requesting the Personnel Director to check each item of information and procedure as being either essential, very important, important, of little importance, or of no importance to the selection of teachers.

A letter (Appendix II) was enclosed with each questionnaire requesting return of the questionnaire and with an explanation of the purpose of the study. Materials and forms used in the selection of teachers by the school system were also requested. Specifically the following items, if prepared or revised during the past three years, were requested: application forms, reference blanks, forms used in recording results of personal interviews or oral examinations, blank forms for reporting on physical examination, forms used in establishing eligibility lists, contract forms, notices of appointment, and permanent personnel record form.

An envelope with the author's return address and appropriate postage was included with the questionnaire mailed to the panel of experts and the personnel directors to enhance the return of the materials. Three weeks after the initial response from the Personnel Directors, a follow-up letter (Appendix IV) was sent to those systems that had not replied. This yielded a total of sixty-four returns. The last four returns were obtained by personally appealing to the school districts by letter and telephone.

III. Treatment of Data

The data collected by the questionnaire was tabulated, assembled, and keypunched onto IBM cards. The data was quantified as follows:

Essential	(5)
Very Important	(4)
Important	(3)
Of Little Importance	(2)
Of No Importance	(1)

The analysis of variance was used for testing the significance of difference in the degree of importance placed upon each of the informational and procedural items by the Personnel Directors in the public school systems and the panel of experts.

Where a significant F-score results, the *t* technique was applied to determine the level of significance of the difference. The .05 level of confidence was considered significant.

The statistical procedures (mean, standard deviation or standard error, and F-score) applied to the collected data and the findings with respect to the selection and appointment of teachers forms the basis of Chapters IV and V of the study.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Introduction

Data for this study were collected from the personnel directors in the public school systems of Louisiana and from a panel of experts in the field of school personnel administration. Responses to the questionnaire were received from sixty-four of the sixty-six public school systems and from all eleven members of the panel of experts. Table 1 indicates the number and percentage of returns from the personnel directors and the panel of experts. The percent of returns from the panel of experts was 100, and from the personnel directors of the public school systems it was 96.97.

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Returns for the Personnel Directors and the Panel of Experts

Category	Total	Number Returned	Percent of Returns
Public School Systems	66	64	96.97
Panel of Experts	11	11	100
Total	77	75	97.40

The total number of teachers employed in the public school systems of Louisiana in 1970-71 school session was 38,900. (Edwards, 1971). The total number of teachers employed by the responding school

systems was 38,516. These figures indicate that public school systems responding to the questionnaire employed 99.01 percent of the public school teachers in the State of Louisiana while the public school systems not responding employed less than one percent of the public school teachers.

In responding to the questionnaire, the personnel directors were requested to check the appropriate weight placed upon each informational and procedural item generally used in their school systems. Members of the panel of experts were requested to check the appropriate weight of each informational and procedural item that they thought should be placed upon each item. An analysis of these responses is reported in this chapter.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

In responding to the questionnaire, some personnel directors did not check each item. Table 2 indicates the number and percent of responses to each informational item by the personnel directors. The table indicates that personnel directors responded 100 percent on thirty-eight informational items, 98.4 percent on fifteen items, 96.9 percent on fifteen items, 95.3 percent on two items, and 92 percent on one item.

The hypotheses related to the informational items are:

1. There are no significant differences in the opinions of personnel directors and a panel of experts as to the importance of each of the seventy-one items of information that may be used in the evaluation of prospective teachers.

Table 2

Number and Percentage of Responses on Informational Items by Personnel Directors

Informational Items	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Categories:		
1. Family background	64	100
2. Personal criteria	64	100
3. Academic criteria	64	100
4. Results of examinations	64	100
5. Experience related to teaching	64	100
6. Experience unrelated to teaching	63	98.4
7. Job requirements	62	96.9
8. Professional opinions	62	96.9
Family Background:		
9. National origin	64	100
10. Size of family	64	100
11. Father's occupation	64	100
12. Socio-economic status	64	100
13. Marital status of parents	64	100
14. Home ownership--type and location	63	98.4
15. Family reputation--citizenship and morality	59	92.0
Personal Criteria:		
16. Age	63	98.4
17. Health	64	100
18. Cultural background	63	98.4
19. Marital status	63	98.4
20. Sex	64	100
21. Broad and diverse geographic background	64	100
22. Personality	64	100
23. Cooperative attitude	64	100
24. Religious affiliation	64	100
25. Church participation	64	100
26. Photograph of the candidate	64	100
27. Credit record	64	100
28. Neatness, dress and grooming	64	100
29. Fraternity membership	64	100
30. Voice and speech	64	100
31. Professional writings	64	100
32. Membership in professional organizations	63	98.4
33. Interest in teaching specific subjects	64	100
34. Attitude toward minority groups	64	100
35. Expressed educational philosophy	63	98.4

Table 2 (continued)

Informational Items	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Academic Criteria:		
36. Number of subject matter courses taken	64	100
37. Grades in subject matter courses	63	98.4
38. Number of professional education courses taken	64	100
39. Grades in professional education courses	64	100
40. Number and type of courses in major field	64	100
41. Grades in major field courses	64	100
42. Number and type of courses in minor field	64	100
43. Grades in monor field courses	64	100
44. Number of graduate credits of degrees	64	100
45. Student teaching grade	64	100
46. Special abilities	64	100
Examination Results:		
47. National Teacher Examinations	63	98.4
48. Graduate Record Examination	63	98.4
49. Mental ability (intelligence)	62	96.9
50. Paper and pencil test	62	96.9
51. Social studies, literature and fine arts tests	62	96.9
52. Science and mathematics tests	61	95.3
53. Personality test	62	96.9
54. Aptitude test	61	95.3
Experience Related to Teaching:		
55. Subject/s taught in student teaching	64	100
56. Years of teaching experience	64	100
57. Teaching minority groups	62	96.9
58. Teaching majority groups	62	96.9
59. Experience in special subjects	63	98.4
Experience Unrelated to Teaching:		
60. Work experience other than teaching	63	98.4
61. Experience with minority groups	62	96.9
62. Experience with majority groups	62	96.9
63. Experience in special areas	62	96.9

Table 2 (continued)

Informational Items	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Job Requirements:		
64. Job specifications	62	96.9
65. Job description	62	96.9
66. Personnel needs of the department	62	96.9
Professional Opinions of:		
67. Supervisor of student teaching	63	98.4
68. School board members	63	98.4
69. Supervisors in the school system	63	98.4
70. The principal involved	64	100
71. The faculty	62	96.9

2. There are no significant differences with respect to the hierarchy of the informational items utilized by the personnel directors in the selection of teachers.

3. Personnel directors indicate that there are no significant differences in importance of eight categories of informational items in the evaluation of teacher candidates for positions in the public school systems of Louisiana.

4. There are no significant differences in the importance of the informational items in the eight categories which may be utilized in the selection of teachers by personnel directors.

An analysis of variance formula was used for testing the significance of differences in the degree of importance placed upon the seventy-one informational items by the personnel directors and the panel of experts. Where a significant F-score resulted, the t technique was applied to determine the level of significance of the difference.

The mean, standard error, and F-score for the informational items for personnel directors and the panel of experts are presented in Table 3. F-scores of 3.83 and above were significant at or below the .05 level. Levels of significance above the .05 level are listed as "NS", indicating that the F-scores for those items were not significant.

Means ranging from four to five were interpreted to denote an item which was considered to be very important to essential to the selection of teachers; means ranging from three to four were interpreted to denote an item which was considered to be important to very important; means ranging from two to three were interpreted to denote an item which

was considered to be of little importance to important; and means ranging from one to two were interpreted to denote an item which was considered to be of little or of no importance to the selection of teachers.

Table 3 indicates that the F-scores for sixty-one informational items were not significant. This denotes that there were no significant differences in the opinions between the personnel directors and the panel of experts as to the importance of the sixty-one informational items in the selection of prospective teachers. The null hypothesis was accepted for each of the sixty-one items.

Of the sixty-one informational items for which the null hypothesis was accepted, the means of the personnel directors and the panel of experts indicated that thirteen items were very important to essential in the selection of prospective teachers. Items included in this group were: (1) job requirements, (2) health, (3) cooperative attitude, (4) neatness, dress and grooming, (5) interest in teaching special subjects, (6) attitude toward minority groups, (7) expressed educational philsosphy, (8) number and type of courses in major field, (9) student teaching grade, (10) subject/s taught in student teaching, (11) opinion of the supervisor of student teaching, (12) opinion of the supervisor in the school system, and (13) opinion of the principal.

The personnel directors and the panel of experts agreed upon twenty-three items falling into the important to very important category. Items included in this group were: (1) results of examinations, (2) experience related to teaching, (3) age, (4) cultural background, (5) photograph of the candidate, (6) credit record,

Table 3

Means, Standard Errors and F-Score for Personnel Directors and Panel of Experts on Informational Items

Items of Information	Personnel Directors Mean	S.E.	Panel of Experts Mean	S.E.	F-Score	Level
Categories:						
1. Family background	2.64	.12	2.18	.30	2.04	NS
2. Personal criteria	3.95	.10	4.55	.24	5.27	.02
3. Academic criteria--general and professional	4.30	.08	4.91	.19	8.49	.01
4. Results of examinations	3.44	.11	3.27	.27	0.31	NS
5. Experience related to teaching	3.95	.12	3.91	.28	0.02	NS
6. Experience unrelated to teaching	3.08	.10	2.64	.24	2.81	NS
7. Job requirements	3.81	.10	4.27	.25	2.89	NS
8. Professional opinions	3.85	.09	4.36	.23	4.27	.04
Family Background:						
9. National origin	2.27	.13	1.73	.31	2.59	NS
10. Size of family	1.95	.11	1.55	.27	1.98	NS
11. Father's occupation	1.75	.08	1.82	.20	0.09	NS
12. Socio-economic status	2.03	.10	2.09	.25	0.05	NS
13. Marital status of parents	1.98	.11	1.55	.28	2.14	NS
14. Home ownership--type and location	2.06	.11	1.91	.27	0.28	NS
15. Family reputation--citizenship and morality	3.03	.15	2.55	.36	1.59	NS
Personal Criteria:						
16. Age	3.51	.11	3.64	.27	0.20	NS
17. Health	4.23	.09	4.64	.21	3.07	NS
18. Cultural background	3.24	.10	3.00	.25	0.77	NS
19. Marital status	2.52	.16	2.91	.38	0.89	NS
20. Sex	2.33	.17	2.90	.40	1.60	NS
21. Broad and diverse geographic background	2.84	.10	3.09	.23	0.97	NS

Table 3 (continued)

Items of Information	Personnel Directors Mean	S.E.	Panel of Experts Mean	S.E.	F-Score	Level
Personal Criteria (continued):						
22. Personality	4.33	.07	4.73	.17	4.90	.03
23. Cooperative attitude	4.55	.07	4.73	.18	0.86	NS
24. Religious affiliation	1.95	.12	1.82	.29	0.19	NS
25. Church participation	2.20	.12	2.00	.28	0.45	NS
26. Photograph of the candidate	2.92	.15	3.45	.35	1.96	NS
27. Credit record	3.33	.13	3.73	.31	1.43	NS
28. Neatness, dress and grooming	4.17	.08	4.09	.19	0.15	NS
29. Fraternity membership	1.52	.09	1.45	.23	0.06	NS
30. Voice and speech	3.92	.10	4.73	.24	9.92	.01
31. Professional writings	2.55	.10	2.73	.23	0.51	NS
32. Membership in professional organizations	3.00	.10	3.36	.24	1.92	NS
33. Interest in teaching specific subjects	3.81	.10	4.27	.23	3.30	NS
34. Attitude toward minority groups	3.84	.11	4.18	.26	0.94	NS
35. Expressed educational philosophy	3.94	.11	4.09	.26	0.31	NS
Academic Criteria:						
36. Number of subject matter courses taken	3.70	.11	3.82	.26	0.17	NS
37. Grades in subject matter courses	3.62	.10	3.91	.24	1.30	NS
38. Number of professional education courses taken	3.80	.11	4.00	.27	0.47	NS
39. Grades in professional education courses	3.53	.10	4.09	.23	5.01	.03
40. Number and type of courses in major field	4.03	.09	4.45	.23	3.02	NS
41. Grades in major field courses	3.75	.10	4.00	.22	1.07	NS
42. Number and type of courses in minor field	3.64	.10	4.18	.24	4.33	.04
43. Grades in minor field courses	3.47	.10	4.00	.23	4.40	.04
44. Number of graduate credits or degrees	3.52	.11	3.82	.25	.122	NS
45. Student teaching grade	3.91	.09	4.36	.23	3.41	NS
46. Special abilities	3.56	.10	3.91	.23	1.93	NS

Table 3 (continued)

Items of Information	Personnel Directors Mean	S. E.	Panel of Experts Mean	S.E.	F-Score	Level
Examination Results:						
47. National Teacher Examinations	3.29	.13	3.00	.31	0.70	NS
48. Graduate Record Examination	2.86	.12	2.55	.28	1.05	NS
49. Mental ability (intelligence) test	3.02	.11	2.64	.26	1.79	NS
50. Paper and pencil test	2.39	.11	2.27	.27	0.16	NS
51. Social studies, literature and fine arts tests	2.53	.11	2.55	.26	0.00	NS
52. Science and mathematics tests	2.57	.11	2.36	.26	0.56	NS
53. Personality test	2.85	.13	2.37	.30	0.15	NS
54. Aptitude test	2.87	.12	2.91	.28	0.02	NS
Experience Related to Teaching:						
55. Subject's taught in student teaching	4.02	.11	4.09	.25	0.07	NS
56. Years of teaching experience	3.80	.12	4.00	.28	0.44	NS
57. Teaching minority groups	3.60	.13	3.55	.32	0.02	NS
58. Teaching majority groups	3.48	.13	3.55	.32	0.03	NS
59. Experience in special subjects	3.56	.12	3.90	.28	1.20	NS
Experience Unrelated to Teaching:						
60. Work experience other than teaching	2.90	.11	3.00	.26	0.11	NS
61. Experience with minority groups	3.06	.11	3.18	.28	0.15	NS
62. Experience with majority groups	3.02	.11	3.18	.27	0.31	NS
63. Experience in special areas	3.08	.12	3.45	.28	1.51	NS
Job Requirements:						
64. Job specifications	3.65	.12	4.18	.29	2.99	NS
65. Job description	3.63	.12	4.18	.29	3.07	NS
66. Personnel needs of the department	4.10	.10	4.64	.25	4.03	.05

Table 3 (continued)

Items of Information	Personnel Directors Mean	S.E.	Panel of Experts Mean	S.E.	F-Score	Level
Professional Opinions of:						
67. Supervisor of student teaching	4.13	.10	4.36	.24	0.83	NS
68. School board members	2.37	.13	2.00	.32	1.09	NS
69. Supervisors in the school system	4.13	.09	3.91	.22	0.80	NS
70. The principal involved	4.36	.08	4.45	.20	0.20	NS
71. The faculty	3.03	.12	3.91	.28	8.11	.01

(7) membership in professional organizations, (8) number of subject matter courses taken, (9) grades in subject matter courses, (10) number of professional education courses taken, (11) grades in major field courses, (12) number of graduate credits or degrees, (13) special abilities, (14) National Teacher Examinations results, (15) years of teaching experience, (16) experience in teaching minority groups, (17) experience teaching majority groups, (18) experience in special subjects, (19) non-teaching experience with minority groups, (20) non-teaching experience with majority groups, (21) experience in special areas, (22) meeting job specifications, and (23) meeting job description requirements.

The null hypothesis was accepted for nineteen informational items falling into the of little importance to important category. These items were: (1) family background, (2) experience unrelated to teaching, (3) national origin, (4) socio-economic status, (5) family reputation, (6) marital status, (7) sex, (8) broad and diverse geographic background, (9) church participation, (10) professional writings, (11) Graduate Record Examination results, (12) mental ability, (13) paper and pencil test, (14) social studies, literature and fine arts tests, (15) science and mathematics tests, (16) personality test, (17) aptitude test, (18) work experience other than teaching, and (19) the opinion of school board members.

The personnel directors and the panel of experts agreed that fraternity membership, religious affiliation, type and location of home ownership, marital status of parents, father's occupation, and size of family were of little or of no importance in the evaluation of teacher candidates.

The null hypothesis was rejected for ten informational items for which significant F-scores were found. Six of these informational items were found to be very important to essential and four were found to be important to very important to the evaluation of a prospective teacher. The items considered very important to essential were: (1) personal criteria, (2) academic criteria--general and professional, (3) professional opinions, (4) personality, (5) voice and speech, and (6) personnel needs of the department. The four items considered important to very important were: (1) grades in professional education courses, (2) number and type of courses in minor field, (3) grades in major field courses, and (4) the opinions of faculty members.

In all instances in which a significant difference of opinion existed between the personnel directors and the panel of experts with respect to the rating of informational items, the panel regarded the items as being more significant than did the personnel directors.

To summarize, the personnel directors and the panel of experts considered sixty-five of the seventy-one informational items to be of some importance in the selection of teachers and six items to be of little or of no importance in the selection of teachers. Of the sixty-five items considered to be of some importance in the selection of teachers, nineteen items were found to be very important to essential, twenty-seven items to be important to very important, and nineteen items to be of little importance to important.

Significant F-scores were found for ten of the informational items. The null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level for the ten

items, of which seven were at the .05 level and three at the .01 level of confidence.

For each informational item for which the null hypothesis was rejected, a t test was computed to test the significance of the differences between the means of the personnel directors and the panel of experts. These t ratios are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

T-Ratios between Means of Importance of Informational Items for Personnel Directors and Panel of Experts

Items of Information	Personnel Directors Mean	S.E.	Panel of Experts Mean	S.E.	t Ratio	Level
2. Personal criteria	3.95	.10	4.55	.24	2.30	.05
3. Academic criteris-- general & professional	4.30	.08	4.91	.19	2.91	.01
8. Professional opinions	3.85	.09	4.36	.23	2.07	.05
22. Personality	4.33	.07	4.73	.17	2.21	.05
30. Voice and speech	3.92	.10	4.73	.24	3.15	.01
39. Grades in professional education courses	3.53	.10	4.09	.23	2.24	.05
42. Number and type of courses in minor field	3.64	.10	4.18	.24	2.08	.05
43. Grades in minor field courses	3.47	.10	4.00	.23	2.10	.05
66. Personnel needs of the department	4.00	.10	4.64	.24	2.01	.05
71. Opinions of the faculty members	3.03	.12	3.91	.28	2.85	.01

Presented in Table 4 are the ten items of information from Table 3 which indicated a significant F-score. The means and standard errors of the personnel directors and the panel of experts, the t-ratios, and the level of significance of the t- ratios are presented. Ratios were determined from Table D (Garrett, 1966:461), a table of t

utilizing the degrees of freedom and probability of the significance of statistics. T-ratios of 2.00 and above were significant at the .05 or better level.

Table 4 indicates that the personnel directors and the panel of experts did not agree on any of the ten items of information. A study of the data indicates a significant difference on all items, seven at the .05 level and three at the .01 level of confidence. A study of the means reveals that the panel of experts held all ten items more important in the selection of teachers than did the personnel directors.

Table 5 reveals the importance placed upon the category items by the panel of experts and the personnel directors. The means standard deviation of the items, and their ranks are indicated.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Categories of Informational Items

Category	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
Academic criteria	1	4.39	.64
Personal criteria	2	4.04	.79
Experience related to teaching	3	3.95	.93
Professional opinions	4	3.93	.75
Job requirements	5	3.88	.84
Results of examinations	6	3.41	.91
Experience unrelated to teaching	7	3.01	.81
Family background	8	2.57	.98

Table 5 indicates that academic criteria is ranked first with a mean value of 4.39. Second is personal criteria with a mean of 4.04. The means of these two items indicate they were considered to be very important to essential in the selection of teachers. Five categories

were considered to be important to very important, ranked as follows: experience related to teaching, professional opinions, job requirements, results of examinations and experience unrelated to teaching. Considered as of little importance to important, and ranked last in importance, was family background.

Table 6 lists the means, standard deviations, and rank of informational items in the family background category.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Family Background Category

Item	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
Family reputation	1	2.96	1.18
National origin	2	2.19	1.02
Home ownership	3	2.04	.89
Socio-economic status	4	2.04	.83
Marital status of parents	5	1.92	.92
Size of family	6	1.89	.89
Father's occupation	7	1.76	.68

Ranked first in the family background category was family reputation with a mean of 2.96, which is considered to be important to very important. Other items in the important to very important level were national origin, home ownership, and socio-economic status. In the of little importance to important level were marital status of parents, size of family, and father's occupation. No item in this category was considered to be very important to essential or of little or of no importance to the selection of teachers.

The means, standard deviations and ranks of items in the personal criteria category are indicated in Table 7.

Table 7

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Personal Criteria Category

Item	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
Cooperative attitude	1	4.57	.60
Personality	2	4.39	.55
Health	3	4.29	.70
Neatness, dress and grooming	4	4.16	.64
Voice and speech	5	4.04	.78
Attitude toward minority groups	6	3.97	.87
Expressed educational philosophy	7	3.96	.86
Interest in teaching specific subjects	8	3.88	.76
Age	9	3.53	.88
Credit record	10	3.39	1.02
Cultural background	11	3.20	.83
Membership in Professional organizations	12	3.05	.80
Photograph of candidates	13	3.00	1.17
Broad and diverse geographic background	14	2.88	.77
Marital status	16	2.58	1.25
Professional writings	16	2.57	.78
Sex	17	2.41	1.33
Church participation	18	2.17	.92
Religious affiliation	19	1.93	.95
Fraternity membership	20	1.51	.75

Table 7 indicates that five items were considered to be very important to essential, eight items were considered important to very important, five items were considered to be of little importance to important, and two items were considered to be of little or of no importance in the personal criteria category. The items considered to be very important to essential in order of importance were cooperative attitude; personality; health; neatness, dress and grooming; and voice and speech. The items considered to be important to very important in rank order were attitude toward minority groups, expressed educational philosophy, interest in teaching specific subjects, age, credit record, cultural

background, membership in professional organizations, and photograph of candidates. Of lesser importance in rank order were broad and diverse geographic background, marital status, professional writings, sex, and church participation. Of little or of no importance in the consideration of prospective teachers were religious affiliation and fraternity membership.

Table 8 indicates the means, standard deviations and ranks of items in the academic category.

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Academic Criteria Category

Item	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
Number and type of courses in major field	1	4.09	.75
Student teaching grade	2	3.97	.76
Number of professional education courses taken	3	3.83	.91
Grades in major field courses	4	3.79	.74
Number of subject matter courses taken	5	3.72	.85
Number and type of courses in minor field	6	3.72	.80
Grades in subject matter courses	7	3.66	.78
Special abilities	8	3.61	.76
Grades in professional education courses	9	3.61	.77
Number of graduate credits or degrees	10	3.56	.84
Grades in minor field courses	11	3.55	.78

In the academic criteria category, one item was ranked as very important to essential and the other ten items were considered to be important to very important in the selection of teachers. The number and type of courses in major field was considered as important to

essential with a mean average of 4.09. Those items in order of rank which were considered to be important to very important were student teaching grade, number of professional educational courses taken, grades in major field courses, number of subject matter courses taken, number and type of courses in minor field, grades in subject matter courses, special abilities, grades in professional education courses, number of graduate credits or degrees, and grades in minor field courses. All items in the academic criteria were considered to be less than important. Grades in minor field courses, which ranked last, had a mean average of 3.55.

Table 9 lists the means, standard deviations, and ranks of items in the examination results category.

Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Examination Results Category

Item	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
National Teacher Examinations	1	3.24	1.05
Mental ability test	2	2.96	.87
Aptitude test	3	2.88	.94
Personality test	4	2.83	1.01
Graduate Records Examination	5	2.81	.93
Science and mathematics tests	6	2.54	.86
Social studies, literature and fine arts tests	7	2.53	.86
Paper and pencil tests	8	2.37	.88

In the examination results category, no item was considered to be very important to essential. One item was considered to be important to very important and seven items were considered to be of some importance in the selection of teachers. The National

Teacher Examinations results was considered to be important to very important with a mean average of 3.24. It was followed in order of importance by mental ability test; aptitude test; personality test; Graduate Record Examination; science and mathematics tests; social studies, literature and fine arts tests; and paper and pencil test results,which were all considered to be of some importance in the selection of prospective teachers.

The means, standard deviations and ranks of items in the experience related to teaching category are listed in Table 10.

Table 10

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Experience Related to Teaching Category

Item	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
Subject/s taught in student teaching	1	4.03	.84
Years of teaching experience	2	3.83	.94
Experience in special subjects	3	3.60	.92
Teaching minority groups	4	3.59	1.06
Teaching majority groups	5	3.49	1.05

Table 10 indicates that one item, subject/s taught in student teaching, ranked first and was considered to be very important to essential with a mean average of 4.02. The other four items in this category were considered to be important to very important, and in order of importance were years of teaching experience, experience in special subjects, teaching minority groups and teaching majority groups. No item in this category was considered to be less than important in the selection of prospective teachers.

Table 11 lists the means, standard deviations and rank of items in the experience unrelated to teaching category.

Table 11

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Experience Unrelated to Teaching Category

Item	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
Experience in special areas	1	3.14	.93
Experience with minority groups	2	3.08	.91
Experience with majority groups	3	3.04	.91
Work experience	4	2.92	.88

No item in this category was considered to be very important to essential; however, three items were considered to be important to very important and one item was considered to be of some importance in the selection of teachers. Experience in special areas, experience with minority groups, and experience with majority groups were considered to be important to very important with mean averages of 3.14, 3.08, and 3.04, respectively. Work experience was considered to be of some importance with a mean average of 2.92.

Table 12 indicates that personnel needs of the department ranked first in the job requirement category of informational items, with a mean average of 4.18. Job requirements was considered to be very important to essential, while job specifications and job description were considered to be important to very important, with mean averages of 3.73 and 3.77, respectively.

Table 12

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items in the Job Requirement Category

Item	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
Personnel needs of the department	1	4.18	.82
Job specifications	2	3.73	.95
Job description	3	3.71	.91

Indicated in Table 13 are the means, standard deviations and ranks of items in the professional opinions category. Ranked as very important to essential were the opinions of the principal, supervisor of student teaching and the supervisor in the school system with mean averages of 4.37, 4.16 and 4.09, respectively. Considered to be important to very important was the opinion of the faculty, with a mean average of 3.16. The opinion of school board members was considered to be of some importance, with a mean average of 2.31. No item in the professional opinion category was considered to be of little or of no importance.

Table 13

Means, Standard Deviation and Ranks of Items in the Professional Opinions Category

Item	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
The principal involved	1	4.37	.66
Supervisor of student teaching	2	4.16	.80
Supervisor in school system	3	4.09	.74
The faculty	4	3.16	.94
School board members	5	2.31	1.07

To compare the responses to the category items and the category groups of informational items, the means, standard deviations and F-scores are listed in Table 14. This table indicates that there was a significant difference between the responses to the category items and the category groups of items by the personnel directors and the panel of experts. This table shows that category items were rated higher than the average rate of the items within the category groups. All differences were significance at the .01 level.

Table 14

Means, Standard Errors and F-Score between Category Items and Category Groups of Informational Items

Groups	Category Items Mean	S.D.	Category Groups Mean	S.D.	F-Score	Level
Family background	2.57	.98	2.08	.70	.65	.01
Personal criteria	4.04	.79	3.26	.54	.40	.01
Academic criteria	4.38	.64	3.73	.60	.50	.01
Results of examinations	3.41	.91	2.70	.74	.48	.01
Experience related to teaching	3.95	.93	3.65	.86	.57	.01
Experience unrelated to teaching	3.01	.81	2.97	.90	.30	.01
Job requirements	3.88	.84	3.77	1.04	.60	.01
Professional opinions	3.93	.75	3.58	.61	.57	.01

In comparing category groups, numerials were assigned to each group for identification. Number one is family criteria, two is personal criteria, three is academic criteria, four is examination results, five is teaching experience, six is other experience, seven is job requirements, and eight is professional opinions.

Category groups were compared by cross correlation in Table 15. Table 15 lists the t-ratios between category groups of informational items.

Table 15

T-Ratios between Category Groups of Informational Items

Group #	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	3.97[b]	5.16[b]	1.67[NS]	3.37[b]	1.70[NS]	2.57[a]	3.95[b]
2		2.17[a]	1.97[NS]	.97[NS]	.62[NS]	.82[NS]	1.07[NS]
3			3.27[b]	.19[NS]	1.65[NS]	.05[NS]	.46[NS]
4				2.04[a]	.52[NS]	1.64[NS]	2.33[a]
5					1.15[NS]	.15[NS]	.15[NS]
6						1.05[NS]	1.16[NS]
7							.29[NS]

a--Significant at .05 level
b--Significant at .01 level
NS--Not significant

A significant difference was found between nine category groups, five at the .01 level and four at the .05 level. No significant difference was found between nineteen various comparisons of category groups. The greatest significant difference was between number 1 (family criteria) and number 3 (academic criteria). Other significant differences at the .01 level were between 1 and 2 (family criteria and personal criteria); 1 and 5 (family criteria and teaching experience); 1 and 8 (family criteria and professional opinions). In each comparison, family criteria was considered of least importance. Also found significant at the .01 level was 3 and 4 (academic criteria and examination results). Academic criteria was considered more important than examination results.

Significant differences at the .01 level were found between 1 and 7, 2 and 3, and 4 and 5; and significant differences at the .05 level were found between 4 and 8. Job requirements (7) was found to be more important than family criteria (1); academic criteria (3) more important than personal criteria (2); teaching experience (5) more important than examination results (4); and professional opinions (8) was considered more important than examination results (4).

No significant differences were found between family criteria and examination results; family criteria and other experience; personal cirteria and examination results; personal criteria and teaching experience; personal criteria and other experience; personal criteria and job requirements; personal criteria and professional opinions; academic criteria and teaching experience; academic criteria and other experience; academic and professional opinions; examination results and other experience; examination results and job requirements; teaching experience and other experience; teaching experience and job requirements; teaching experience and professional opinions; other experience and job requirements; other experience and professional opinions; and job requirements and professional opinions. Academic criteria and job requirements had the least amount of difference, with a *t*-ratio of .05.

Table 16 lists the average means of the items in the category groups for the personnel directors and the panel of experts.

Table 16

Table of Means of Category Groups for
Personnel Directors and Panel of Experts

Category Groups	Means for Personnel Directors	Means for Panel of Experts
Family Criteria	2.12	1.88
Personal Criteria	3.23	3.46
Academic Criteria	3.68	4.05
Examination Results	2.71	2.63
Teaching Experience	3.63	3.75
Other Experience	2.93	3.20
Job Requirements	3.67	4.33
Professional opinions	3.55	3.73

This table indicates that the personnel directors rated family criteria and examination results higher than the panel of experts did. The panel of experts rated personal criteria, academic criteria, teaching experience, other experience, job requirements, and professional opinions higher than did the personnel directors. In general, the panel of experts ranked items higher than did the personnel directors.

To make independent sets of comparisons, category groups of informational items were numbered as follows: family criteria as one, personal criteria as two, academic criteria as three, examination results as four, teaching experience as five, other experience as six, job requirements as seven, and professional opinions as eight.

Table 17 and Table 18 show seven independent comparisons from the responses of personnel directors and the panel of experts. Criteria generally considered as personal factors (family criteria and personal criteria) were compared to all other category groups, family criteria was compared to personal criteria, opinions of

professionals was compared to other non-personal factors, job requirements was compared to academic related factors and experience, academic related factors were compared to experience in general, academic criteria was compared to teaching experience, and teaching experience was compared to non-teaching experience.

Table 17

Independent Set of Comparisons for Personnel Directors

Comparisons	Definition or Statement	T-Value
1& 2 vs. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7& 8	Personal factors vs. other non-personal factors	12.54**
1 vs. 2	Family criteria vs. personal criteria	11.64**
8 vs. 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7	Opinions vs. other non-personal factors	3.03**
7 vs. 3, 4, 5, & 6	Job requirements vs. academic and experience related factors	5.37**
3 & 4 vs. 5 & 6	Academic related factors vs. experience	1.32NS
3 vs. 4	Academic criteria vs. examination results	10.14**
5 vs. 6	Teaching experience vs. non-teaching experience	7.34**

*--Significant at .05 level
**--Significant at .01 level
NS--Not Significant

Table 17 indicates the results of these seven independent comparisons from the responses of the personnel directors. This table indicates a significant difference between personal factors and other non-personal factors at the .01 level. A study of means indicates that other non-personal factors were considered more important than personal factors. When family criteria was compared to personal criteria, a significant difference

Table 18

Independent Set of Comparisons for Panel of Experts

Comparisons	Definition or Statement	T-Value
1& 2 vs. 3,4,5,6,7,&8	Personal factors vs. other non-personal factors	6.59**
1 vs. 2	Family criteria vs. personal criteria	6.39**
8 vs. 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7	Opinions vs. other non-personal factors	.71NS
7 vs. 3, 4, 5, & 6	Job requirements vs. academic and experience related factors	4.74**
3 & 4 vs. 5 & 6	Academic related factors vs. experience	.79NS
3 vs. 4	Academic criteria vs. examination results	5.76**
5 vs. 6	Teaching experience vs. non-teaching experience	2.19*

*--Significant at .05 level
**--Significant at .01 level
NS--Not significant

was found at the .01 level. Personal criteria was found to be more important than family criteria. In the third comparison, opinions of professionals was compared to other non-personal factors. It was found that on the average professional opinions was considered more important than other non-personal factors. Job requirements was compared to academic related factors and experience in the fourth comparison. It was found that job requirements was more significant than the average of the academic related factors and experience. In the fifth comparison, academic related factors were compared to experience and found to be of no significant differences. Academic related factors were no more important than experience in the evaluation of teachers. When academic criteria was compared to examination

results, a significant difference was found at the .01 level. In comparing the means of academic criteria and examination results, it was found that academic criteria was more important than examination grades. Teaching experience was compared to non-teaching experience in the seventh comparison. It was found that teaching experience was more important than non-teaching experience at the .01 level.

Table 18 is a comparison of the responses from the panel of experts concerning the same seven independent sets. In examining the seven comparisons, the panel of experts indicated the same importance to each of the independent comparisons as did the personnel directors, with two exceptions. The first exception was in the comparison of opinions of professionals to other non-personal factors. While the personnel directors indicated a significant difference, the panel of experts indicated that there was no significant difference between professional opinions and other non-personal factors. The second exception was with respect to the level of significance of teaching experience and non-teaching experience. Both the personnel directors and panel of experts indicated a significant difference, the personnel directors at the .01 level and the panel of experts at the .05 level. The personnel directors and panel of experts indicated that there was no significant difference between academic related factors and experience.

PROCEDURAL ITEMS

Not all personnel directors who responded to the questionnaire checked each procedural item. Table 19 indicates the number and percent of responses to each procedural item by the personnel directors in the

Table 19

Number and Percent of Responses on Procedural Items by Personnel Directors

Procedural Item	Total Responses	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Obtaining a List of Candidates:			
1. Acquaintances of the superintendent	64	62	96.9
2. Through professional acquaintances	64	62	96.9
3. Professional placement bureaus	64	61	95.3
4. Commercial placement bureaus	64	61	95.3
5. Through solicited applications	64	62	96.9
6. Through unsolicited applications	64	63	98.4
7. Through other school systems	64	62	96.9
8. Recommendations by lay personnel	64	61	95.3
9. Through state teacher associations	64	60	93.8
Collection of Information:			
10. Application forms	64	64	100
11. Written reports	64	62	96.9
12. Transcripts	64	64	100
13. References	64	63	98.4
14. Certification records	64	64	100
15. Interviews	64	63	98.4
16. Classroom observations	64	63	98.4
17. Written examinations	64	63	98.4
18. Oral examinations	64	63	98.4
19. Evaluation by former employer	64	63	98.4
20. Physical examination	64	63	98.4
Selection of Teachers:			
21. Determination of job position requirements by job description	64	63	98.4
22. Determination of job position requirements by job specifications	64	62	96.9
23. Recruitment of applicants based upon a planned program	64	62	96.9
24. Personnel strengths needed for the department	64	63	98.4
25. Faculty participation in standards to be met	64	61	95.3
26. Principal involved in the selection and evaluation	64	64	100
27. Supervisors involved in the selection and evaluation	64	64	100
28. Board members help in the evaluation of applicants	64	63	98.4

public school systems of Louisiana. The table indicates that personnel directors responded 100 percent to five items, 98.4 percent to eleven items, 96.9 percent to seven items, 95.3 percent to four items, and 93.8 percent to one item.

The hypotheses related to the procedural items were:

1. There are no significant differences in the opinions of personnel directors and a panel of experts as to the relative importance of the twenty-eight procedural items which may be utilized in the selection of teachers.

2. Personnel directors indicate that there are no significant differences with respect to the importance of the procedural items which may be utilized in the selection of teachers.

3. Personnel directors indicate that there will be no significant differences in the importance of the three categories of procedural items which may be utilized in the selection of teachers.

4. There are no significant differences in the importance of the procedural items in the three categories that may be utilized in the selection of teachers by personnel directors.

An analysis of variance formula was used for testing the significance of differences in the degree of importance placed upon the twenty-eight procedural items by the personnel directors and the panel of experts. Where a significant F-score resulted, the t technique was applied to determine the level of significance of the difference.

The mean, standard error and F-score for the procedural items for the personnel directors and the panel of experts are presented in Table 20. F-scores of 3.83 and above were significant at or below

Table 20

F-Scores for Personnel Directors and the Panel of Experts
Concerning Procedural Items

Procedural Items	Personnel Directors Mean	S.E.	Panel of Experts Mean	S.E.	F-Score	Level
Obtaining a List of Candidates:						
1. Acquaintances of the superintendent	2.68	.13	2.45	.31	.44	NS
2. Through professional acquaintances	3.23	.11	3.55	.27	1.18	NS
3. Professional placement bureaus	2.95	.14	3.55	.33	2.70	NS
4. Commercial placement bureaux	1.98	.10	2.36	.23	2.27	NS
5. Through solicited applications	3.35	.13	3.91	.30	2.87	NS
6. Through unsolicited applications	3.14	.12	3.36	.28	.51	NS
7. Through other school systems	3.10	.12	2.91	.28	.39	NS
8. Recommendations by lay personnel	2.38	.10	2.45	.24	.09	NS
9. Through state teacher associations	2.85	.10	3.00	.24	.33	NS
Collection of Information:						
10. Application forms	4.27	.10	4.55	.24	1.14	NS
11. Written reports	3.40	.11	3.64	.27	1.65	NS
12. Transcripts	4.05	.10	4.64	.25	4.63	.03
13. References	4.32	.09	4.55	.22	.91	NS
14. Certification records	4.41	.10	4.64	.24	.76	NS
15. Interviews	4.54	.08	4.91	.18	3.46	NS
16. Classroom observations	3.75	.11	3.82	.26	.07	NS
17. Written examinations	2.71	.10	2.73	.24	.002	NS
18. Oral examinations	2.78	.11	2.45	.26	1.27	NS
19. Evaluation by former employer	4.08	.10	4.18	.25	.14	NS
20. Physical examination	3.35	.12	4.00	.29	4.18	.04

Table 20 (continued)

Procedural Items	Personnel Directors Mean	S.E.	Panel of Experts Mean	S.E.	F-Score	Level
Selection of Teachers:						
21. Determination of job position requirements by job description	3.95	.10	4.36	.23	2.63	NS
22. Determination of job position requirements by job specifications	3.89	.10	4.36	.25	3.09	NS
23. Recruitment of applicants based upon a planned program	3.84	.10	4.55	.24	7.34	.01
24. Personnel strengths needed for the department	4.17	.09	4.64	.22	3.82	.05
25. Faculty participation in standards to be met	3.46	.11	3.73	.26	.91	NS
26. Principal involved in the selection and evaluation	4.17	.08	4.91	.19	12.41	.001
27. Supervisors involved in the selection and evaluation	4.14	.09	4.18	.22	.03	NS
28. Board members' help in the evaluation of applicants	2.30	.12	2.09	.28	.47	NS

the .05 level. Levels of significance above the .05 level are listed as "NS" indicating that the F-scores for those items were not significant.

Means ranging from 4 to 5 were interpreted to denote an item which was considered to be very important to essential to the selection of teachers; means ranging from 3 to 4 to denote an item considered to be important to very important; means ranging from 2 to 3 to denote an item considered to be of little to important; and means ranging from 1 to 2 to denote an item considered to be of little or of no importance.

Table 20 indicates that the F-scores for twenty-three of the procedural items were not significant. This denotes that there were no significant differences in the opinions between the personnel directors and the panel of experts as to the importance of the twenty-three procedural items in the selection of prospective teachers. The null hypothesis was accepted for each of the twenty-three items.

Of the twenty-three procedural items for which the null hypothesis was accepted, the means for the personnel directors and panel of experts indicated that eight items were very important to essential in the selection of prospective teachers. Items included in this group were (1) application forms, (2) references, (3) certification recors, (4) interviews, (5) evaluation by former employer, (6) determination of job position requirements by job description, (7) determination of job position requirements by job specifications, and (8) supervisors involved in the selection and evaluation.

The personnel directors and panel of experts agreed upon eight items falling into the important to very important category.

Items included in this group were (1) a list of candidates obtained through professional acquaintances, (2) a list of candidates obtained from professional placement bureaus, (3) a list of candidates obtained through solicited applications, (4) a list of candidates obtained through unsolicited applications, (5) a list of candidates obtained through other school systems, (6) collection of information through written reports, (7) information obtained from classroom observations, and (8) faculty participation in standards to be met in the selection of teachers.

The null hypothesis was accepted for seven procedural items falling into the of little importance to important category. These items were: (1) a list of candidates obtained through acquaintances of the superintendent, (2) a list of candidates obtained from commercial placement bureaus, (3) a list of candidates obtained through recommendations by lay personnel, (4) a list of candidates obtained through state teacher associations, (5) information collected from written examinations, (6) information collected from oral examinations, and (7) board members' help in the evaluation of applicants in the selection of prospective teachers.

No procedural item was considered to be of little or of no importance by the personnel directors or the panel of experts.

The null hypothesis was rejected for five procedural items for which significant F-scores were found. Four of these procedural items were found to be very important to essential and one was found to be important to very important in the selection of prospective teachers. The items considered to be very important to essential were: (1) collection of information through transcripts, (2) recruitment

of applicants based upon a planned program (3) selection of teachers based upon personnel strengths needed for the department, and (4) involvement of the principal in the selection and evaluation of prospective teachers. The one item considered to be important to very important is the collection of information through physical examination.

For each procedural item where a significant difference of opinion existed between the personnel directors and the panel of experts, the panel regarded the items as being more significant than did the personnel directors.

To summarize, the personnel directors and panel of experts considered all twenty-eight procedural items to be of some importance in the selection of teachers. Twelve items were judged to be very important to essential, nine items to be important to very important, seven items to be of little importance to important, and no items of procedure to be of little or of no importance in the selection of prospective teachers.

Significant F-scores were found for five of the twenty-eight procedural items. The null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level for the five items: including one at the .05 level, one at the .04 level, one at the .03 level, one at the .01 level, and one at the .001 level.

For each procedural item for which the null hypothesis was rejected, a t test was computed to test the significance of the differences between the means of the personnel directors and the panel of experts. These t-ratios are presented in Table 21.

Table 21

T-Ratios between Means of Importance of Procedural Items for Personnel Directors and the Panel of Experts

Procedural Item	Personnel Directors		Panel of Experts		t Ratio	Level
	Mean	S.E.	Mean	S.E.		
12. Transcripts	4.05	.10	4.64	.25	2.15	.05
20. Physical examination	3.35	.12	4.00	.29	2.04	.05
23. Recruitment of applicants based upon a planned program	3.84	.10	4.55	.24	2.71	.01
24. Personnel strengths needed for the department	4.17	.09	4164	.22	1.95	NS
26. Principal involved in the selection and evaluation	4.17	.08	4.91	.19	3.52	.01

NS--Not significant

Presented in Table 21 are the five procedural items, and their means, standard errors, t-ratios and levels, for which a significant F-score was indicated in Table 20. Ratios were determined from Table D (Garrett, 1966:461), a table of t utilizing the degree of freedom and probability of the significance of statistics. T-ratios of 2.00 and above were significant at the .05 or better level.

Table 21 indicates that the personnel directors and the panel of experts agreed on one item and disagreed on the other four. A study of the data indicates a significant difference on four items, two at the .05 level and two at the .01 level, and no significant difference on one item. A study of the means reveals that the panel of experts held all five items more important in the selection of teachers than did the personnel directors.

Table 22 reveals the importance placed upon the category items by the panel of experts and the personnel directors. The means and standard deviations, and their ranks are indicated. The table indicates that the collection of information is ranked first, with a mean value of 3.82; second is selection of items, with a mean of 3.78; and third is the list of candidates, with a mean of 2.88. The means of these three categories indicate that collection of information and selection items were considered to be important to very important and the list of candidates was considered to be of little importance to important in the selection of teachers.

Table 22

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Procedural Categories

Group	Rank	Mean of Category	Standard Deviation
Collection of Information	1	3.82	.82
Selection of Items	2	3.78	.79
List of candidates	3	2.88	.92

Table 23 lists the means, standard deviations, and ranks of procedural items in the list of candidates category. Ranked first in this category was a list of candidates through solicited applications, with a mean of 3.44, which is considered to be important to very important. Other items in the important to very important level were applications received through professional acquaintances, a list of candidates through unsolicited applications, a list through other school systems, and a list of candidates from professional placement bureaus. In the of little importance to important level were a list

of candidates obtained through state teacher associations, a list of candidates obtained through acquaintances of the superintendent, a list recommended by lay personnel, and a list obtained from commercial placement bureaus. No item in the list of candidates category was considered to be very important to essential or of little or of no importance to the selection of prospective teachers.

Table 23

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items for Acquiring a List of Candidates

Item	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
Through solicited application	1	3.44	1.00
Through professional acquaintances	2	3.27	.90
Through unsolicited applications	3	3.18	.94
Through other school systems	4	3.07	.92
Professional placement bureaus	5	3.04	1.11
Through state teacher associations	6	2.87	.80
Acquaintances of the superintendent	7	2.64	1.02
Recommendations by lay personnel	8	2.39	.78
Commercial placement bureaus	9	2.04	.77

The means, standard deviations, and ranks of items in the collection of information category are indicated in Table 24. This table indicates that six items were considered to be very important to essential, three to be important to very important, and two considered to be of little importance to important in the selection of teachers. No item was considered to be of little or of no importance. The items considered to be very important to essential in order of importance

are interviews, certification records, references, application forms, transcripts, and evaluation by former employer. The items considered to be important to very important in rank order were classroom observations, physical examination, and written reports. The two items considered to be of little importance to important were oral examination and written examinations. No item in this category was considered to be of little or of no importance in the consideration of prospective teachers.

Table 24

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Items for the Collection of Information

Item	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
Interviews	1	4.59	.61
Certification records	2	4.44	.81
References	3	4.35	.73
Application forms	4	4.31	.80
Transcripts	5	4.13	.84
Evaluation by former employer	6	4.09	.84
Classroom observations	7	3.76	.86
Physical examination	8	3.45	.97
Written reports	9	3.44	.88
Oral examinations	10	2.73	.88
Written examinations	11	2.72	.81

Table 25 lists the means, standard deviations and ranks of items in the selection of teachers category. Four items were ranked as very important to essential, three as important to very important, and one as of little importance to important in the selection of teachers. In order of rank and considered to be very important to essential were principal involved in the selection and evaluation, personnel strengths needed for the department, supervisors involved

in the selection and evaluation, and determination of job position requirements by job description. Considered to be important to very important were determination of job position requirements by job specifications, recruitment of applicants based upon a planned program, and faculty participation in standards to be met. Board members' help in the evaluation of applicants was considered to be of little importance to important in the selection of teachers. No item in this category was considered to be of little or of no importance.

Table 25

Means, Standard Deviations and Ranks of Selection Items

Item	Rank	Mean of Item	Standard Deviation
Principal involved in the selection and evaluation	1	4.28	.64
Personnel strengths needed for the department	2	4.24	.72
Supervisors involved in the selection and evaluation	3	4.15	.72
Determination of job position requirements by job description	4	4.01	.78
Determination of job position requirements by job specifications	5	3.96	.83
Recruitment of applicants based upon a planned program	6	3.95	.80
Faculty participation in standards to be met	7	3.50	.86
Board members' help in the evaluation of applicants	8	2.27	.94

In comparing category groups of procedural items, numerals were assigned to each group for identification. Number 1 is list of candidates category, number 2 is the collection of information category, and number 3 is selection of teachers category.

Category groups of procedural items were compared by cross correlation and the results are indicated in Table 26.

Table 26

T-Ratios between Category Groups of Procedural Items

Group	2	3
1	2.96**	2.18*
2	-	.131NS

Significant differences were found between the list of candidates category and the collection of information category at the .01 level, and between the list of candidates category and the selection of teachers category at the .05 level. No significant differences were found between the collection of information category and the selection of teachers category.

TERMINAL ITEMS

The personnel directors in the public school systems were asked to indicate the terminal procedures used for the appointment of teachers in their respective school systems. The personnel directors were to indicate whether objective criteria were used in the selection of teachers and, if so, whether the criteria had been developed by the school system or recommended by the Louisiana Teachers' Association.

Table 27 indicates that 53.1 percent of the public school systems did not use a set of objective criteria, 40.6 percent used a set of objective criteria in the selection of teachers. Of the public

school systems responding to the questionnaire, 6.3 percent did not reply to the item. The table indicates that of the 40.6 percent using objective criteria, 32.8 percent used a set of criteria other than that recommended by the Louisiana Teachers' Association, while 7.8 percent used the objective criteria developed through the efforts of the Louisiana Teachers' Association.

Table 27

Number and Percent of Public School Systems Using or Not Using Objective Criteria

Items	Number Responding	Percent
Using Louisiana Teachers' Associations recommended objective criteria	5	7.8
Using other objective criteria	21	32.8
Not using objective criteria	34	53.1
Not replying	4	6.3

Table 28 lists the various terminal procedures used by the public school systems in the appointment of teachers. Appointment in which the superintendent takes the initial step by nominating the candidate who is then approved or disapproved by the school board, constitutes 8.28 percent of the total. In 4.6 percent of the school systems, the superintendent nominates the candidate and a committee of the board appoints with the approval of the board. The board authorizes by resolution that the superintendent fill any vacancies that occur in 4.6 percent of the school systems. In 2.2 percent of the systems, the superintendent and principal recommend the candidate to the board for approval. The assistant superintendent or personnel director recommends a teacher candidate to the superintendent, who

then recommends to the board for approval in 2.2 percent of the school systems. In one school system, the personnel director recommends appointment to the superintendent, district board members, and principal of the school for approval.

Table 28

Number and Percent of Using Various Procedures in the Appointment of Teachers

Item	Number Responding	Percent
The superintendent nominates the candidate who is then approved or disapproved by the school board	53	82.8
The superintendent nominates, a committee of the board appoints with the approval of the board	3	4.6
Board authorizes by resolution that superintendent fill any vacancies that occur	3	4.6
Superintendent and principal with approval of the board	2	2.2
Assistant superintendent or personnel director recommends appointment to superintendent who recommends to the board	2	2.2
Personnel director recommends to superintendent, board members in district, and principal; if approved by all three, the appointment is made	1	1.6

Table 29 indicates the number and percent of the public school systems requiring or not requiring the signing of a contract.

Table 29

Number and Percent of Public School Systems Requiring or Not Requiring the Signing of a Contract

Item	Number Responding	Percent
Requiring the signing of a contract	47	73.4
Not requiring the signing of a contract	16	25.0
Not replying	1	1.6

The table shows that 73.4 percent of the school systems which responded require the prospective teacher to sign a contract while 25.0 percent of the school systems do not require the prospective teacher to sign a contract. Of the responding school systems, one system or 1.6 percent of the public school systems did not reply to either item.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The most important challenge currently facing personnel directors in the public schools is that of teacher selection. Due to the large number of applicants completing for teaching positions, court mandated objective criteria, and the increasing educational needs of the students, personnel directors must utilize valid criteria and procedures in the selection of competent teachers. This study was conducted to identify the informational and procedural items most frequently used in the selection of teachers in the public school systems of Louisiana.

Data for this study were collected through the construction of a survey instrument. Returns were received from 64 of the 66 public school systems of Louisiana and a panel of eleven experts in the field of personnel administration. The analysis of variance was used in the compilation and evaluation of the data returned. The data were presented and analyzed in twenty-nine tables in Chapter 4.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The findings from this study of informational and procedural items utilized in teacher selection in the public school systems of Louisiana consisted of the following:

1. Personnel directors and the panel of experts agreed to the importance of sixty-one of the seventy-one informational items.

2. Personnel directors and the panel of experts disagreed

as to the importance placed upon ten of the informational items. Of these items the differences were significant for seven items at the .05 level and for three items at the .01 level.

3. Where a significant difference existed, the panel of experts consistently ranked the informational item higher than did the personnel directors.

4. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered nineteen informational items to be very important to essential in the selection of teachers. These items are:

a. Job requirements
b. Health
c. Cooperative attitude
d. Neatness, dress and grooming
e. Interest in teaching special subjects
f. Attitude toward minority groups
g. Expressed educational philosophy
h. Number and type of courses in major field
i. Student teaching grade
j. Subject/s taught in student teaching
k. Opinion of the supervisor of student teaching
l. Opinions of the supervisor in the school system
m. Opinion of the principal
n. Personal criteria
o. Academic criteria-general and professional
p. Professional opinions
q. Personality
r. Voice and speech
s. Personnel needs of the department

5. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered twenty-seven informational items to be important to very important in the selection of teachers. These items are:

a. Results of examinations

b. Experience related to teaching

c. Age

d. Cultural background

e. Photograph of the candidate

f. Credit record

g. Membership in professional organizations

h. Number and subject matter courses taken

i. Grades in subject matter courses

j. Number of professional education courses taken

k. Grades in major field courses

l. Number of graduate credits or degrees

m. Special abilities

n. National Teachers Examination results

o. Years of teaching experience

p. Experience in teaching minority groups

q. Experience in teaching majority groups

r. Experience in special subjects

s. Non-teaching experience with minority groups

t. Non-teaching experience with majority groups

u. Experience in special areas

v. Meeting job specifications requirements

w. Meeting job description requirements

x. Grades in professional education courses

y. Number and type of courses in minor field

z. Grades in minor field courses

aa. The opinions of faculty members

6. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered nineteen informational items as of little importance to important in the selection of teachers. These items are:

a. Family background

b. Experience unrelated to teaching

c. National origin

d. Socio-economic status

e. Family reputation--citizenship and morality

f. Marital status

g. Sex

h. Broad and diverse geographic background

i. Church participation

j. Professional writings

k. Graduate Records Examination results

l. Mental ability test results

m. Paper and pencil test results

n. Social studies, literature and fine arts tests results

o. Science and mathematics tests results

p. Personality test results

q. Aptitude test results

r. Work experience other than teaching

s. The opinion of school board members

7. The personnel directors and the panel of experts agreed that fraternity membership, religious affiliation, type and location

of home ownership, marital status of parents, father's occupation, and size of family was of little or of no importance in the selection of prospective teachers.

8. The personnel directors ranked the categories of informational items in the following order:

a. Academic criteria

b. Personal criteria

c. Experience related to teaching

d. Professional opinions

e. Job requirements

f. Results of examinations

g. Experience unrelated to teaching

h. Family background

9. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered two of the categories of informational items to be very important to essential, five categories to be important to very important and one category to be of little importance to important in the selection of teachers. Items considered as very important to essential are academic and personal criteria. Considered as important to very important are experience related to teaching, professional opinions, job requirements, results of examinations, and experience unrelated to teaching. Family background was considered to be of little importance to important in the selection of teachers.

10. The personnel directors and the panel of experts ranked the informational items in the family background category in the following order:

a. Family reputation

b. National origin

c. Home ownership

d. Socio-economic status

e. Marital status of parents

f. Size of family

g. Father's occupation

11. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered no items in the family background category to be very important to essential or to be important to very important in the selection of teachers. They considered four items to be of little importance to important and three items to be of little or of no importance to the selection of teachers. Considered to be of little importance to important are family reputation, national origin, home ownership, and socio-economic status. Considered to be of little or of no importance are marital status of parents, size of family and father's occupation.

12. The personnel directors and the panel of experts ranked the informational items in the personal criteria category in the following order:

a. Cooperative attitude

b. Personality

c. Health

d. Neatness, dress and grooming

e. Voice and speech

f. Attitude toward minority groups

g. Expressed educational philosophy

h. Interest in teaching specific subjects

i. Age

j. Credit record

k. Cultural background

l. Membership in professional organizations

m. Photograph of candidate

n. Broad and diverse geographic background

o. Marital status

p. Professional writings

q. Sex

r. Church participation

s. Religious affiliation

t. Fraternity membership

13. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered five of the informational items in the personal criteria to be very important to essential, eight items to be important to very important, five items to be of little importance to important, and two items to be of little or of no importance in the selection of teachers. The items considered to be very important to essential are cooperative attitude; personality; health; neatness, dress and grooming; and voice and speech. Items considered to be important to very important are attitude toward minority groups, expressed educational philosophy, interest in teaching specific subjects, age, credit record, cultural background, membership in professional organizations, and photograph of the candidate. Items considered to be of little importance to important are board and diverse geographic background, marital status,

professional writings, sex, and church participation. Items considered to be of little or of no importance are religious affiliation and fraternity membership.

14. The personnel directors and the panel of experts ranked the informational items in academic criteria category in the following order:

a. Number and type of courses in major field
b. Student teaching grade
c. Number of professional education courses taken
d. Grades in major field courses
e. Number of subject matter courses taken
f. Number and type of courses in minor field
g. Grades in subject matter courses
h. Special abilities
i. Grades in professional education courses
j. Number of graduate credits or degrees
k. Grades in minor field courses

15. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered one item in the academic criteria category to be very important to essential, and ten items to be important to very important in the selection of teachers. No item in this category was considered to be of little importance to important or of little or of no importance. Considered to be very important to essential is number and type of courses in major field. Items considered to be important to very important are student teaching grade, number of professional education courses taken, grades in major field courses, number of subject matter

courses taken, number and type of courses in minor field, grades in subject matter courses, special abilities, grades in professional education courses, number of graduate credits or degrees, and grades in minor field courses.

16. The informational items in the examination results category were ranked in the following order by the personnel directors and the panel of experts:

a. National Teachers Examination results
b. Mental ability test results
c. Aptitude test results
d. Personality test results
e. Graduate Record Examination results
f. Science and mathematics tests results
g. Social studies, literature and fine arts tests results
h. Paper and pencil test results

17. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered no informational item in the examination results category to be very important to essential or of little or of no importance, one item to be important to very important, and seven items to be of little importance to important in the selection of teachers. National Teachers Examination results are considered to be important to very important, and mental ability test, aptitude test, personality test, Graduate Record Examination, science and mathematics tests, social studies, literature and fine arts tests, and paper and pencil test results are considered to be of little importance to important in the evaluation of prospective teachers.

18. The personnel directors and the panel of experts ranked the informational items in the experience related to teaching category in the following order:

a. Subject/s taught in student teaching

b. Years of teaching experience

c. Experience in special subjects

d. Teaching minority groups

e. Teaching majority groups

19. In the experience related to teaching category, the personnel directors and the panel of experts considered one item to be very important to essential, four items to be important to very important, and no item to be of little importance to important or of little or of no importance to the selection of teachers. The item considered to be very important to essential is subject/s taught in student teaching. Items considered to be important to very important are years of teaching experience, experience in special subjects, teaching minority groups, and teaching majority groups.

20. The personnel directors and the panel of experts ranked the informational items in the experience unrelated to teaching category in the following order:

a. Experience in special areas

b. Experience with minority groups

c. Experience with majority groups

d. Work experience

21. In the experience unrelated to teaching, the personnel directors and the panel of experts considered no items to be very important to essential or of little or of no importance in the

selection of teachers. They considered three items to be important to very important and one to be of little importance to important. Items considered to be important to very important are experience in special areas, experience with minority groups, and experience with majority groups. Considered to be of little importance to important is work experience.

22. The items of information in the job requirement category are ranked in the following order by the personnel directors and the panel of experts:

a. Personnel needs of the department

b. Job specifications

c. Job description

23. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered one item to be very important to essential, and two items to be important to very important in the job requirement category. Considered to be very important to essential is personnel needs of the department, and considered to be important to very important are job specifications and job description.

24. In the professional opinions category, the personnel directors and the panel of experts ranked the informational items in the following order:

a. The principal involved

b. Supervisor of student teaching

c. Supervisor in the school system

d. The faculty

e. School board members

25. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered three items of information to be very important to essential, one item to be important to very important, and one item to be of little importance to important in the professional opinions category. Considered to be very important to essential are the principal involved, supervisor of student teaching and supervisor of the school system. Considered to be important to very important is the faculty and considered to be of little importance to important is school board members.

26. Significant differences were found in the importance placed upon the category items and the category groups of items by the personnel directors and the panel of experts. In each case, category items were placed higher than the average of the importance placed upon the category groups of items.

27. The personnel directors and the panel of experts placed greater importance upon some categories groups of informational items than they did on others. A significant difference was found between nine category groups of items, five at the .01 level and four at the .05 level. In nineteen cross correlations, no significant differences were indicated.

28. The panel of experts generally placed greater importance upon the category groups of informational items than did the personnel directors. The panel of experts considered the following category groups more important than did the personnel directors: personal criteria, academic criteria, teaching experience, other experience, job requirements, and professional opinions. The personnel directors placed more importance upon family criteria and examination results than did the panel of experts.

29. Both the panel of experts and the personnel directors placed more importance upon non-personal factors than they did upon personal factors. In considering personal factors, they indicated that personal criteria were more important than family criteria.

30. The personnel directors indicated that professional opinions were more important than other non-personal factors while the panel indicated no significant differences between professional opinions and other non-personal factors.

31. Both the panel of experts and the personnel directors indicated that job requirements were more important than experience and academic related factors.

32. The personnel directors and the panel of experts indicated that there were no significant differences between academic related factors and experience.

33. Academic criteria were considered more important than examination results by the personnel directors and the panel of experts.

34. The panel of experts and the personnel directors indicated that teaching experience was more important than non-teaching experience.

35. The personnel directors and the panel of experts generally agreed as to the importance of procedural items. They agreed on twenty-three procedural items and disagreed as to the importance of five items.

36. Where a significant difference existed the panel of experts consistantly ranked the procedural items higher than did the personnel directors.

37. The panel of experts and the personnel directors considered twelve procedural items to be very important to essential in the selection of teachers. These items are:

a. Application forms

b. References

c. Certification records

d. Interviews

e. Evaluation by former employer

f. Determination of job position requirements by job description.

g. Determination of job position requirements by job specifications.

h. Supervisors involved in the selection and evaluation

i. Collection of information through transcripts

j. Recruitment of applicants based upon a planned program

k. Selection of teachers based upon needed personnel strengths of the department.

l. Involvement of the principal in the selection and evaluation of prospective teachers

38. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered nine procedural items to be important to very important. These items are:

a. A list of candidates obtained through professional acquaintances

b. A list of candidates obtained from professional placement bureaus

c. A list of candidates obtained through solicited applications

d. A list of candidates obtained through unsolicited applications

e. A list of candidates obtained through other school systems

f. Collection of information through written reports

g. Information obtained from classroom observations

h. Faculty participation in standards to be met in the selection of teachers

i. Collection of information through physical examinations

39. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered seven procedural items falling into the category of little importance to important. These items are:

a. A list of candidates obtained through acquaintances of the superintendent

b. A list of candidates obtained from commercial placement bureaus

c. A list of candidates obtained through recommendations by lay personnel

d. A list of candidates obtained through state teachers associations

e. Information collected from written examinations

f. Information collected from oral examinations

g. Board member help in the evaluation of applicants

40. The personnel directors and the panel of experts indicated that no procedural item was considered to be of little or of no importance to the selection of teachers.

41. The personnel directors and the panel of experts ranked the procedural categories in the following order:

a. Collection of information

b. Selection of items

c. List of candidates

42. The panel of experts and the personnel directors considered no procedural category to be very important to essential. They considered two categories, collection of information and selection of items, to be important to very important, and one category, list of candidates, to be of little importance to important in the selection of teachers.

43. The personnel directors and the panel of experts ranked the procedural items in the list of candidates category in the following order:

a. Through solicited applications

b. Through professional acquaintances

c. Through unsolicited applications

d. Through other school systems

e. From professional placement bureaus

f. Through state teachers associations

g. From acquaintances of the superintendents

h. From recommendations by lay personnel

i. From commercial placement bureaus

44. The panel of experts and the personnel directors considered no procedural items in the list of candidates category to be very important to essential. They considered five items to be important to very important and four items to be of little importance to important

in the selection of teachers. Considered to be important to very important are solicited applications, professional acquaintances, unsolicited applications, applications from other school systems, and applications from professional placement bureaus. Considered to be of little importance to important are applications from state teachers associations, acquaintances of the superintendent, recommendations by lay personnel, and applications from commercial placement bureaus. No item in this category was considered to be of little or of no importance in obtaining a list of candidates.

45. The personnel directors and the panel of experts ranked the procedural items in the collection of information category in the following order:

a. Interviews
b. Certification records
c. References
d. Application forms
e. Transcripts
f. Evaluation by former employer
g. Classroom observations
h. Physical examination
i. Written reports
j. Oral examinations
k. Written examinations

46. The personnel directors and the panel of experts considered six of the procedural items in the collection of information category to be very important to essential, three items to be important to very important, and two items considered to be of little importance

to important in the selection of teachers. Considered to be very important to essential are interviews, certification records, references, application forms, transcripts, and evaluation by former employer. Considered to be important to very important are classroom observations, physical examinations and written reports. Oral examinations and written examinations were considered to be of little importance to important. No item in this category was considered to be of little or of no importance in the selection of teachers.

47. The panel of experts and the personnel directors ranked the procedural items in the selection items category in the following order:

a. Principal involved in the selection and evaluation

b. Personnel strengths needed for the department

c. Supervisors involved in the selection and evaluation

d. Determination of job position requirements by job description

e. Determination of job position requirements by job specifications

f. Recruitment of applicants based upon a planned program

g. Faculty participation in standards to be met

h. Board members help in the evaluation of applicants

48. Four procedural items in the selection items category are considered to be very important to essential, three items to be important to very important, and one item to be of little importance to important in the selection of teachers. Items considered to be very important to essential are principal involved in the selection and evaluation, personnel strengths needed for the department,

supervisors involved in the selection and evaluation, and determination of job position requirements by job description. Considered to be important to very important are determination of job position requirements by job specifications, recruitment of applicants based upon a planned program, and faculty participation in standards to be met. The item considered to be of little importance to important is board members help in the evaluation of applicants. No item in this category was considered to be of little or of no importance in the selection of teachers.

49. Significant differences were found in the importance placed upon the procedural categories by the personnel directors and the panel of experts. The personnel directors and the panel indicated that collection of information category and selection items category were significantly more important than obtaining a list of candidates. No significant differences were found between collection of information category and selection items category.

50. Personnel directors indicated that public school systems did not use the objective criteria mandated by federal courts in the Lee Case (1971) which is similar to that developed by the Louisiana Teachers Associations task force. It was indicated that 32.8 percent of the public school systems have developed their own objective criteria and that 53.1 percent does not use objective criteria.

51. In comparing the importance placed upon items in this study with the objective criteria mandated by the court, it appears that the objective criteria recommended by the court is narrow in scope, places emphasis on criteria not necessarily indictive of competent teaching ability.

52. The personnel directors indicated that 95.4 percent of the public school systems appoint the selected teachers through the process of the superintendent or a member of his staff nominating the candidate who is then approved by the school board. In 4.6 percent of the school systems, the board gives blanket permission to the superintendent and his staff to fill all vacancies.

53. The personnel directors indicated that 25.0 percent of the public school systems do not require the signing of a contract while 73.4 percent require the signing of a contract or a letter of intent.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study provide the basis from which the the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Personnel directors and the panel of experts generally agreed as to the importance placed upon the items of information and procedures used in the evaluation of prospective teachers.

2. There is a hierarchy of informational and procedural items that may be utilized in the selection. Some items are considered to be very important to essential, some important to very important, while others are considered to be of little importance to important or of little or of no importance in the selection of teachers.

3. Certain categories of informational items are considered more important than others in the evaluation of prospective teachers.

4. There appears to be a difference in the importance of informational items within the various informational categories.

5. Some categories of procedural items are considered of greater importance in the process of teacher selection than are other procedural categories.

6. Procedural items within categories have varying degrees of importance placed upon them, with some procedural items in each category being considered more important than others.

7. It appears that twenty-five percent of the public school systems of Louisiana are in violation of Revised Statutes 17:413 of the Louisiana Constitution in not requiring the signing of contracts in the employment of teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made relative to the findings and conclusions of this study:

1. School boards should develop specific policies regarding teacher selection so that a definite procedure is followed.

2. School personnel directors should rely heavily upon the nineteen informational items which the personnel directors and the panel of experts ranked as very important to essential in the evaluation of prospective teachers.

3. School personnel directors should place some importance upon the twenty-seven informational items which the personnel directors and the panel of experts ranked as important to very important in the evaluation of teachers for job positions.

4. School personnel directors should place lesser importance upon the informational items ranked by personnel directors and the panel of experts as of little importance to important and should have

specific reasons to justify the use of informational items ranked as of little or no importance in the evaluation of prospective teachers to avoid potential unproductive efforts.

5. School personnel directors should rely heavily upon the twelve procedural items ranked by personnel directors and the panel of experts as very important to essential in the process of teacher selection.

6. School personnel directors should place some importance upon the nine procedural items ranked by the personnel directors and the panel of experts as important to very important in the process of teacher selection.

7. School personnel directors should place lesser importance upon procedural items ranked by personnel directors and the panel of experts to be of little importance to important in the process of teacher selection and personnel directors usually have specific reasons to justify use of those procedures ranked as of little or of no importance to avoid potential unproductive efforts.

8. School boards should review their selection program, and, if necessary, revise or update evaluation processes of teacher candidates in order to avoid direct confrontation with the courts.

9. Additional investigation would be helpful in further establishing the importance placed upon information and procedural items, and in determining the characteristics of a competent teacher.

10. School boards should use the ideas and data presented in this study as a guide in evaluating their present programs. By adapting these data to local situations, boards should be able to make more objective decisions regarding teacher selection.

11. Finally, it is recommended that investigations be conducted to determine the relationships between selection practices and the education of professional personnel.

REFERENCES CITED

Alexander vs. Holmes. 1969. 90 S. t. 29.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. September 1971. "AACTE Bulletin." Volume 24, No. 6.

Amercian Association of School Administrators. 1960. Professional Administrators for America's Schools, Washington: The Association.

Barr, A. S. 1961. Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness, Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar Publishers.

Berea College vs. Commonwealth of Kentucky. 1908. 211 U. S. 45.

Blume, Robert. March, 1971. "Humanizing Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 52:411, No. 7.

Bolling vs. Sharpe. 1954. 347 U. S. 497.

Bowman, Howard A. October, 1963. Review of Educational Research, 33:342, No. 4, Washington D. C.

Brooks, Paul A. 1967. "Teacher Selection Practice in Texas Public Schools," unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton.

Brown vs. Board of Education. 1954. 347 U. S. 483.

Buley, Henton C. 1950. "Personal Characteristics and Staff Patterns Associated With the Quality of Education," unpublished doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, New York.

Carter, Robert vs. West Feliciana Parish School Board. 1970. 396 U. S. 90 S. Ct. 477.

Castetter, William B. 1962. Administering the School Personnel Program, New York: MacMillan Co.

Chandler, B. J. and Paul V. Petty. 1955. Personnel Management in School Administration, Yonkers, New York: World Book Co.

Civil Rights Act, 1964.

Constitution of the State of Louisiana. 1921. Article XII, Section 10, as amended.

Constitution of the United States. 1789. Article VI, Clause 2.

Constitution of the United States. 1789. Tenth Amendment.

Constitution of the United States. 1868. Fourteenth Amendment.

Cuban, Larry. 1970. To Make A Difference: Teaching in the Inner City, New York: The Free Press.

Cubberly, Ellwood P. 1920. The History of Education, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Cumming vs. County Board of Education. 1899. 175 U. S. 528.

Davis, E. Dale. 1966. Focus on Secondary Education, Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Deneen, James. October, 1971. "Black Teachers: Uses and Abuses of Tests," NCME Measurement News, Volume 14, No. 4.

Di Pasquale, Vincent C. 1970. "Teacher Selection as an Imperative for the Improvement of Our Schools." Moorehead State College. Document Resume, Ed 049164.

Dixon, Madeliene. March, 1948. "Selecting Teachers for a School System," The School Executive.

Durflinger, Glenn W. October 1963. "Recruitment and Selection of Prospective Elementary and Secondary School Teachers," Review of Educational Research, 33:355-367, No. 4.

Edwards, Normand (ed.) 1971. Louisiana School Directory, Bulletin No. 1180, Baton Rouge: State Department of Education of Louisiana.

Ellsbree, Willard S. and Edmund E. Reutter, Jr. 1954. Staff Personnel in the Public Schools, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Farr, S. Davis. 1965. "Evaluation and Selection Instruments in Teacher Education Programs," Action for Improvement of Teacher Education: Eighteenth Yearbook. Proceedings of the 1965 annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago: The Association.

Garrett, Henry E. 1966. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

Ghiselli, Edwin E. and Mason Haire. 1960. "The Validation of Selection Tests in the Light of the Dynamic Character of Criteria," Personnel Psychology, 13:225-231.

Gong Lum vs. Rice. 1927. 275 U. S. 78.

Graham, et al vs. Evangeline Parish School Board. 1971. 5th Circuit, W. D., Louisiana, 11053.

Green vs. County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia. 1968. 88 S. Ct. 1689.

Gremillion, J. Berton. 1965. Classroom-Teachers Employment Policies and Practices of Parish and City School Boards in Louisiana, Volume 7, No. 1, Louisiana Education Research Association, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Griffin vs. County School Board of Prince Edward County. 1964. 84 S. Ct. 1226.

Hall vs. St. Helena Parish School Board. 1969. 5th Circuit, 417 F. 2nd 801.

Hall, Roy M. and Antonio M. Vincent. 1960. "Staff-Selection and Assignment," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 3rd Edition, New York: MacMillan Co.

Henderson, George M. 1960. "A Study of Approaches and Procedures for the Employment of Public School Teachers," unpublished doctor's dissertation, University of Oregon.

Kleinman, Lou. September, 1960. "A New Dimension in Teacher Selection," Journal of Educational Sociology, 34:24-33.

Knox, W. B. 1956. "A Study of the Relationship of Certain Environmental Factors to Teaching Success," Journal of Experimental Education, 24:95-141.

Lee and United States vs. Chilton County Board of Education. 1971. 5th Circuit, M.D. Alabama, 3100-N.

Leeson, Jim. May, 1964. "The First Ten Years," Phi Delta Kappan, 45:362-370, No. 8.

Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, 17:81.

Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, 17:413.

Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, 17:442.

Louisiana Teachers Association, amicus curiae. October term, 1969. Memorandum submitted in support of the position of respondent and petitioning school boards. In the Supreme Court of the United States.

Louisiana Teachers Association. July 26, 1971. "Objective Criteria for Employment of Faculty Personnel," Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Lowe, Ross E. March, 1971. "Interviewing for That First Teaching Position," The Balance Sheet, Volume 52, No. 6.

Lykken, D. T. and R. Rose. Autumn, 1962. "Psychological Prediction from Actuarial Tables," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 16: 279-286.

McLaughlin vs. Tilendis. 1968. 398 F. 2nd 287.

McLaurin vs. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. 1950. 339 U. S. 63.

Maryland vs. Wirtz. 1968. 88 S. Ct. 2017.

Miller, Van and Willard B. Spalding. 1952. The Public Administration of American Schools, Yonkers, New York: World Book Co.

Missouri ex rel Gaines vs. Canada, Registrar of the University of Missouri. 1938. 305 U. S. 337.

Monroe, Walter S. 1950. "Teacher Education IV," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, rev. ed., New York: The MacMillan Co.

Phi Delta Kappan. September 1970. "Newsnotes," Volume 52, No. 1.

Plessy vs. Ferguson. 1896. 163 U. S. 537.

Popham, W. James. June, 1971. "Teaching Skill Under Scrutiny," Phi Delta Kappan, 52:559, No. 40.

Public Affairs Research Council. July, 1971. "Compelling Need," Volume 1, No. 1, Information Center on School Desegregation.

Public Affairs Research Council. July, 1971. "Schools in Transition," Information Center on School Desegregation, Volume 1, No. 1.

Roger vs. Paul. 1965. 86 S. Ct. 358.

Ryan, David G. 1960. Characteristics of Teachers, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.

Ryan, David G. 1960. "Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, New York: MacMillan Co.

School Systems and Federal Courts. Proceedings of the 1971 October Conference for School Administrators, Louisiana State University; Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Scott, William E., Jr. 1964. "The Actuarial-Clinical Controversy in Managerial Selection," Business Horizons, 7:89-99, No. 4.

Singleton vs. Jackson Municipal Separate School District, en banc. 1969. 419 F. 2nd 1211, 1220, 5th Circuit.

Sipuel vs. Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma. 1948. 332 U. S. 631.

Slezak, James M. 1959. "An Extension of Studies Concerning the Relationships of Staff Characteristics," unpublished doctor's dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Smith, Edward W. et al. 1961. The Educator's Encyclopedia. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Smith and United States vs. Concordia Parish School Board. 1971. 5th Circuit, W. D. Louisiana, 11577.

Steffensen, James P. 1963. Staff Personnel Administration, Selected Practices and Issues, Washington D. C., U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

Swann vs. Charlott-Macklenburg County, North Carolina. 1970. W. D. N. S., F. Supp. 1974.

Sweatt vs. Painter. 1950. 339 U. S. 620.

Toops, Herbert A. Summer 1945. "Philodophy and Practice of Personnel Selection," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 5:95-130, No. 2.

Turner, R. S. 1964. Contemporary Research on Teaching Effectiveness, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

United States vs. Jefferson County Board of Education et al. 1967. 5th Circuit, 380 F. 2nd 385.

United States vs. Montgomery County Board of Education. 1969. 395 U. S. 89 S. Ct. 1670.

Weber, Clarence A. 1954. Personnel Problems of School Administrators, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Yeager, William A. 1954. Administration and the Teacher, New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

APPENDIX I

LETTER ACCOMPANYING THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE PANEL OF EXPERTS

Dear

Having been recommended as an authority in the field of school administration, your help is requested in a survey analyzing the teacher selection process used by the public school systems of Louisiana. It will be greatly appreciated if you will help to validate the enclosed questionnaire by responding to each item.

The questionnaire will be used in a survey of a sampling of the Louisiana public schools and has been designed as part of a doctoral study at Louisiana State University. Directors of Personnel in the public school systems will be asked to rate each informational and procedural item as essential, very important, important, of little importance, and of no importance in the selection of teachers.

Responses of the directors of personnel will be studied in relation to your responses and those of other authorities in the field of school personnel administration.

Enclosed is an envelope for your convenience in returning the questionnaire. Your cooperation will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Everett G. Doerge
Doctoral Student
Louisiana State University

Robert E. May
Professor of Education
Louisiana State University

APPENDIX II

LETTER SENT TO THE PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL DIRECTORS

Dear

Because of your expertise in teacher selection, you can render important service to the profession by completing the enclosed questionnaire, which is to be used in a study of the informational and procedural items utilized in teacher selection in the public school systems of Louisiana.

The questionnaire has been designed as part of a doctoral study at Louisiana State University and the personnel director's response to each item will be analyzed with the responses of others to determine the item's importance in the selection of teachers.

Whether or not the title is used, please consider the personnel director as the person in the school system who has the responsibility to gather information and make recommendations concerning the selection of prospective teachers.

An envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the questionnaire and other materials. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Everett G. Doerge
Doctoral Student
Louisiana State University

Robert E. May
Professor of Education
Louisiana State University

Recommended by:

James D. Prescott
Executive Secretary
Louisiana School Boards Association

EGD/sah

APPENDIX III

College of Education
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Questionnaire for a Survey
of
Teacher Selection Practices
for
Louisiana Public Schools

Please return to:

Everett G. Doerge
4066 Goodrich, Apt. 1
Baton Rouge, LA 70808

PART 1

In your opinion how important are the following items to the evaluation of applicants for teaching positions? Please check in the appropriate column the degree of importance you feel that personnel directors should place on each item in the selection of teachers. In rating use the following guide:

Essential--information that is absolutely essential to the selection of teachers.

Very Important--information is not absolutely essential but should be provided if applicable and available.

Important--information is of some importance but would not insist that it be supplied if not readily available.

Of Little Importance--information should be provided only if convenient to the applicant.

Of No Importance--information has no bearing on the selection of teachers.

Informational Items	5 Essential	4 Very Important	3 Important	2 Of Little Importance	1 Of No Importance
Categories:					
1. Family background					
2. Personal criteria					
3. Academic criteria--general and professional					
4. Results of examinations					
5. Experience related to teaching					
6. Experience unrelated to teaching					
7. Job requirements					
8. Professional opinions					
Family Background:					
9. National origin					
10. Size of family					
11. Father's occupation					
12. Socio-economic status					
13. Marital status of parents					
14. Home ownership--type and location					
15. Family reputation--citizenship and morality					
Personal Criteria:					
16. Age					
17. Health					
18. Cultural background					
19. Marital status					
20. Sex					

Informational Items	5 Essential	4 Very Important	3 Important	2 Of Little Importance	1 Of No Importance
Personal Criteria:					
21. Broad & diverse geographic background					
22. Personality					
23. Cooperative attitude					
24. Religious affiliation					
25. Church participation					
26. Photograph of the candidate					
27. Cretid record					
28. Neatness, dress and grooming					
29. Fraternity membership					
30. Voice and speech					
31. Professional writings					
32. Membership in professional organizations					
33. Interest in teaching specific subjects					
34. Attitude toward minority groups					
35. Expressed educational philosophy					
Academic Criteria:					
36. Number of subject matter courses taken					
37. Grades in subject matter courses					
38. Number of professional education courses taken					
39. Grades in professional education courses					
40. Number and type of courses in major field					
41. Grades in major field courses					
42. Number and type of courses in minor field					
43. Grades in minor field courses					
44. Number of graduate credits or degrees					
45. Student teaching grade					
46. Special abilities					
Examination Results:					
47. National Teachers Examination					
48. Graduate Records Examination					
49. Mental ability (intelligence) test					
50. Paper and pencil test					
51. Social studies, literature and fine arts tests					

Informational Items	5 Essential	4 Very Important	3 Important	2 Of Little Importance	1 Of No Importance
Examination Results:					
52. Science and mathematics tests					
53. Personality test					
54. Aptitude test					
Experience Related to Teaching:					
55. Subject/s taught in student teaching					
56. Years of teaching experience					
57. Teaching minority groups					
58. Teaching majority groups					
59. Experience in special subjects					
Experience Unrelated to Teaching:					
60. Work experience other than teaching					
61. Experience with minority groups					
62. Experience with majority groups					
63. Experience in special areas					
Job Requirements					
64. Job specifications					
65. Job description					
66. Personnel needs of the department					
Professional Opinions of:					
67. Supervisor of student teaching					
68. School board members					
69. Supervisors in the school system					
70. The principal involved					
71. The faculty					

PART 2

Please check in the appropriate column the degree of importance that personnel directors should place on each selection procedure listed below. Use the same guide as you used for rating the importance of items of information.

Informational Items	5 Essential	4 Very Important	3 Important	2 Of Little Importance	1 Of No Importance
Obtaining a List of Candidates:					
1. Acquaintances of the superintendent					
2. Through professional acquaintances					
3. Professional placement bureaus					
4. Commercial placement bureaus					
5. Through solicited applications					
6. Through unsolicited applications					
7. Through other school systems					
8. Recommendations by lay personnel					
9. Through state teacher associations					
Collection of Information:					
10. Application forms					
11. Written reports					
12. Transcripts					
13. References					
14. Certification records					
15. Interviews					
16. Classroom observations					
17. Written examinations					
18. Oral examinations					
19. Evaluation by former employer					
20. Physical examination					
Selection of Teachers:					
21. Determination of job position requirements by job description					
22. Determination of job position requirements by job specifications					
23. Recruitment of applicants based upon a planned program					
24. Personnel strengths needed for the department					
25. Faculty participation in standards to be met					
26. Principal involved in the selection and evaluation					
27. Supervisors involved in the selection and evaluation					
28. Board members help in the evaluation of applicants					

PART 3

Please check the terminal procedure or procedures used for the appointment of teachers in your school system.

(Check one of the group below)

_____ A. The school board or a committee of the board appoints teachers without official participation of the superintendent.

_____ B. The superintendent takes initial step by nominating the candidate who is then approved or disapproved by the school board.

_____ C. The superintendent nominates several candidates, a committee of the board approves the nomination and then the board as a whole appoints the candidate.

_____ D. The superintendent nominates the candidate, the committee of the board appoints with the approval of the board.

_____ E. Others (Please specify)--

(Check one in the group below)

_____ A. The propsective teacher selected is required to sign a contract.

_____ B. The prospective teacher selected is not required to sign a contract.

(Check one in the group below)

_____ A. The system uses a set of objective criteria recommended by the Louisiana Teachers Association in the selection of teachers.

_____ B. The system uses a set of objective criteria other than that recommended by the Louisiana Teachers Association.

_____ C. The system does not use a set of objective criteria in the selection of teachers.

It would be helpful to receive copies of recently prepared rules and regulations, reports, and blank forms relating to the personnel procedures referred to in this questionnaire. Specifically, please send the following items, if prepared or revised during the past three years:

A. Application forms
B. Reference blanks
C. Forms used in recording results of personal interviews or oral examinations
D. Blank form for reporting on physical examination
E. Forms used in establishing eligibility lists

F. Contract forms
G. Notices of appointment
H. Permanent personnel record form
I. Outline of objective criteria if different from that recommended by the LTA

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
AND AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE
BATON ROUGE · LOUISIANA · 70803

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

April 21, 1972

APPENDIX IV

The many demands of your office have undoubtedly kept you from completing The Questionnaire for a Survey of Teacher Selection Practices for Louisiana Public Schools, which we sent to you some time ago.

Your response to the above questionnaire is important to you and the public school system of Louisiana because it will provide supportive data for school systems developing or revising teacher selection programs or will validate the criteria presently utilized.

Your assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Everett G. Doerge
Doctoral Student
Louisiana State University

Robert E. May
Professor of Education
Louisiana State University

sah